THE CRISIS IN INDIA

BY

K. SRINIVASA RAU

Ex-Member of the Madras Legislative Council, Translator of Subadar Mahomed Beg's Diary of Jubilee Visit to London, and Author of Papers on Social Reform.

MADRAS:
REPRINTED AT THE ADDISON PRESS.

1918.

THE CRISIS IN INDIA

ADDISON PRESS,
MADRAS.

TO

HIS EXCELLENCY

SIR ARTHUR LAWLEY, G.C.S.I.,

G.C.I.E., K.C.M.G.

IN GRATEFUL RECOGNITION

OF

THE WARM SOLICITUDE FOR THE MILLIONS OF THE PROVINCE

ENTRUSTED

TO HIS CARE

THIS BOOK IS, BY KIND PERMISSION, RESPECTFULLY DEDICATED

BY

THE AUTHOR.

CONTENTS.

THE CRISIS IN INDIA.

PREFACE.

"PAGETT, M.P.", is busy writing and publishing his books about India, after as usual a few months' tour. Mr. Keir Hardie, M.P., has written his, Mr. Ramsay Macdonald has written his. These have seen India through their spectacles of English Socialism and English Labour party. English Socialism and English Labour party have no place here in India, though the Socialist and the Labourite would be only too glad to convert the world to his creed. Monsieur J. Chailly wrote in French his "Administrative Problems of India" (translated into English by Sir William Meyer, I.C.S.) after years of observation and study unlike "Pagett, M.P.," who has not as much time at his command as the laborious French Deputy Consul. An American came the other day and went round the country and he seemed to take in everything, but he gave out very little. Reticence was his cardinal point, but he may, for aught one knows, jump on us with his book on India, sooner or later. Thus British India and British Indian Administration are fast becoming the perennial topic for book-writers, British politicians and statesmen of all shades of feeling and all schools of thought. The Indians have been contributing their share of political, social and religious

literature all over the country mainly in English and recently in *some* of the Vernaculars as well, but what commands at present most attention in the Western world is apparently what others say about India and not so much what Indians may have to say of themselves under British rule. Indian views and opinions are taken by foreign writers or globe-trotting M. Ps., just to the extent they tally with their own notions of things, either preconceived or conceived on the spot or on the spur of the moment of their observations in their tour; and the result is book after book seen through this pair of spectacles or that, but none of them comes up to the Indian eye. While the Indian reads all these books about himself and his fellowmen written so kindly and condescendingly by so many foreigners, he is sore tempted to ask himself "while so many are anxious to write about us, and write us up and down as they like, why should we not tell the world about British rule in India, ourselves, to help to a better understanding of things as they are? While we are seeing ourselves frequently enough as seen by others, will not the Western world like to take first-hand views about India under British rule from Indians, instead of being content with hearsay evidence on all sides, from people who may after all have to confess that they have tried to read India aright, but India is still a puzzle to them. It has been a puzzle after all even to the best of Viceroys, Governors, Lieutenant-Governors, Rulers, Administrators and Officers of the best type. It has been a puzzle to the Indians themselves in all conscience. No wonder if only one realizes the vastness and complexity of Indian life and the ever-increasing difficulty of mastering the Indian problems, in a practical working spirit. So

then it may not be one too many for a sketch like this to appear from an Indian, who means well for his country, as much at least as the foreign book-writers do and who knows practically where the shoe pinches. He may labour under some obvious disadvantages, like the want of the literary touch in a foreign language, or want of sufficient knowledge of British Politics,—which perhaps may be a point in his favour,—or above all, want of that knack of advertisement which makes a book in English by an Englishman sell roaringly well in the Western world, and then come down to the Indian plains to be read with dismay and doubt by the Indians themselves for whose benefit, however, it is said to be written. The Indians read such books and say "very clever, but conclusions wrong." So Indians must write more about India and it has got in its favour the fact that it is the Indian who is writing about himself and his fellowmen under British rule. Foreign doctors who wish to treat diseases Indian in the body politic, may be exceedingly well-intentioned and exceedingly able and even correct in very many particulars, in the diagnosis, but the patient may know about his real ailments a little more than all the doctors, and if he and his doctors understand each other a bit better, the treatment may save the patient instead of killing him, with drugs and nostrums which may do well enough in the countries to which the eminent doctors belong, but which may just fail in the Indian climate in reaching the Indian constitution. It is thus that this book may be of some use, however small, as it is written from the Indian point of view, and meant to catch the British eye with a desire to bridge the gulf between India and England.

The writer is, however, not unaware that the views enunciated in the following pages run counter in some respects, to the views held to-day by a considerable body of Indian writers and politicians; but those views have had too exclusive an acceptance hitherto without sufficient scrutiny and discussion; and therefore it is essential that the other side of the picture should be honestly and faithfully presented to the public in the best interests of India and England.

As these problems come to be discussed more largely and with greater freedom from bias of any kind, there can be little doubt that the true interests of the country will be more efficiently and more comprehensively served. It is this consideration alone that has led to the publication of this book and it is hoped that it will receive at the hands of the public an independent and impartial judgment uninfluenced by pre-conceived notions and theories which have acquired more or less unquestioned authority among the generality of Indian politicians.

There can be no doubt that India is passing through a serious transition both socially and politically. The one great point in which the writer of the book believes is the intimate connection between our Social and Political advance and how largely the latter is dependent for its success upon the former. If he has succeeded in bringing out this point clearly and made his countrymen realize the urgent need for an upheaval in the direction of social reformation the writer of these pages will feel amply rewarded.

LAKE VIEW,
COIMBATORE.
September 1911.

K. SRINIVASA RAU.

P. S.—Permission to dedicate the book was very kindly accorded by His Excellency Sir Arthur Lawley on the 15th July, and the publication of the book was finally approved by His Excellency on the 8th September, 1911.

It is remarkable that the declaration suggested in the book as worthy of being made by His Most Gracious Majesty the King-Emperor on the great occasion of the Coronation at Delhi, has been actually announced by His Majesty.

19*th December*, 1911. K. S.

PREFACE

TO THE SECOND EDITION.

The very kind reception accorded to the book by the public and the opinions expressed about it by several eminent men have encouraged me to bring out a Second Edition at what appears to be an opportune moment in Indian politics. In less than two years from its inception, the agitation for Home rule for India has assumed a form and shape which calls for a candid examination of the subject at the hands of every well-wisher of India and England. With the dangers and difficulties of planting democracy in India before making the ground fit for it which I pointed out as early as 1911 when this book was published, we are now face to face. It may not be, therefore, inappropriate to observe that several years ago, before indeed the Home rule agitation was started, I

apprehended the possible consequences of carrying on a political agitation in India and in England for the grant of self-government to India in which those domestic and social problems which have been calling aloud for solution as a preliminary to the introduction of the democratic principle in the Government of the country would be more or less ignored. Men who possess an inside knowledge of Indian conditions and, who are capable of taking a sane, sober and impartial view of the present movement have been honestly stirred to their deepest depths as to what may and will happen if the gift of Home rule to India should come to be made prematurely. There is no patriotism in shutting one's eyes to the hard facts in the Indian social system which is at once the most peculiar, the most rigid and the most unbending the world has ever seen and which opposes at every step the democratic principle. It follows, as a necessary corollary, that the foundations for Home rule, if they have to be laid well and truly, must be on an enlarged and reformed Indian social system and that, till this has been secured, any radical political changes are more likely to do harm than good. That some of us demand Home rule as within the region of practical politics is the greatest compliment we can pay to the breadth and benevolence of British rule. But it is wise to recognize our limitations and build up our fitness for Home rule before taking a plunge into the waters of democracy. The fate of the country is trembling in the balance. While on the one side the small fraction of impatient idealists insist on the immediate grant of Home rule to India, there are on the other side entire classes and communities who are opposed to it as premature. It

is clear that at a time like this the leading men should speak out their minds freely and fearlessly.

"Out of evil cometh good" is a great and true saying. The Home rule agitation has ushered into existence "Justice" and the "Non-Brahman Movement." Friends of Social Reform all over the country will realize that the great conflict between the Home rulers and the anti-Home rulers is nothing more than a loud call for Social Reform once more and will rejoice over it that this conflict only means that we are at the eve of a great Social Reconstruction.

Among the public utterances under the auspices of the Non-Brahman Movement, that of the Zemindar of Telaprole deserves special mention for the clear and telling manner in which he has placed the truth about the social side of the Home Rule Movement. What the Home rulers practically desire is an Indian administration with the British army to guard and to step in just when there is trouble. But what we want still and for a long time to come is the best form of British rule and not merely an ever-receding shadow of the British Government before a game of Indian democracy.

In this small book to which I have added two new chapters, I, as a Social Reformer and a Brahman, have contributed my views. They may be right or they may be wrong. All that I can ask the public to believe is that they are genuine and the result of honest conviction.

K. SRINIVASA RAU.

GUNTUR,
23*rd February*, 1918.

[illegible] Movement at a time like this [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] and [illegible].

One [illegible] 'good,' it is great and [illegible] [illegible]. The Home [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] and their [illegible] Movement." [illegible] Social [illegible] all over the country will realise that the great conflict between the Home [illegible] and the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible].

Among the public [illegible] [illegible] the support of the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] of the [illegible] of [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] for the [illegible] and [illegible] society in which the [illegible] about the social [illegible] the Home Rule Movement. "What the Home [illegible] practically demand is Indian [illegible] with [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] that [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] of the British Government [illegible] a [illegible] of Indian democracy."

In this small book to which I have added two [illegible] chapters, [illegible] Social Reformers and [illegible] have [illegible]. They [illegible] of their [illegible]. At [illegible] I [illegible] the public to believe [illegible] the [illegible] of [illegible] conviction.

M. SRINIVASA RAO

SAIDAPET,
24th February 1918.

THE
CRISIS IN INDIA.

CHAPTER I.

THE PROBLEM.

MONARCHY *versus* DEMOCRACY.

MR. RAMDOSS is awaiting at an Indian railway station the arrival of Mr. Alfred from England whom he had never seen before. On the arrival of the train they make out each other easily enough. While driving out in the evening, Mr. R said to A, "It is so very kind of you to have come here all the way to look me up. I should have been terribly disappointed if you had gone home without coming here."

A.—Oh, no! I should have been disappointed too, if I had not seen you; I wanted to see you.

R.—How long is it since you left India? It must be very interesting indeed to hear from you as to what you think of India now, since you last saw it. What do you think of the changes that have taken place? I must hear from you all about it.

A.—Let me see. I think I was 24 when I came to India. 24 years I have served and 24 years I have been drawing pension.

R.—You are then 72! You are now touring round India?

A.—Yes. I feel quite fit. I like travelling. You see my luggage. How compact and small it is. I can carry it myself: only a bed and a box: I do not drink: I do not smoke: I am very sparing in my diet. I do not care for meat. You see how well I am keeping. By-the-bye, how old is your father? I saw him the other day. He was looking very well indeed.

R.—Yes, thank you. My father is keeping good health. He is a bit older than yourself.

A.—How many languages does your father know?

R.—About half-a-dozen, I think. But, language after all is but a medium. Where the heart speaks it transcends all languages. But where it is deficient, difficulties are only multiplied. But I am straying away. I beg your pardon. I commenced asking you how India strikes you now compared with what it was 24 years ago. 24 years is sufficiently long for comparison and contrast.

A.—Oh, yes. The change is wonderful. It is simply marvellous. Everywhere I see things are quite different from what they were. Things are so changed indeed that one finds it hard to describe. At Calcutta I was at a big dinner at which I saw the foremost Indians and Englishmen. The Hon'ble Mr. Bux was there.

R.—Did he speak?

A.—No. Many spoke, but he would not. It seems he wanted to talk politics but that was not the occasion, you

know. It was no political dinner. It was purely a social one. But Bux was at that moment so socially inclined, I suppose, that he would either talk politics or keep mum and so he was left to his moods.

R.—That was a great pity. I do not think Bux would have done that, had Ranade been alive to-day. With Ranade some of the most cherished principles of Bux appear to have gone. Ranade was for the social first, and for the political next in matters of Indian reform. And so long as Ranade was alive, Bux adhered to that principle. But after his death Bux has allowed himself to be so fully drawn into the vortex of politics that you see him talk about Indian social problems only as an apology to politics and as if some of his friends would charge him with apostacy if he did not tell the public once in a way at least that he has not altogether forgotten the lessons he learnt from Ranade, whom he always refers to as "his master."

A.—You mean to charge Bux then with having forsaken his master!

R.—Oh, no! I do not think Bux will admit that. But all the same he has forsaken his master's creed though he is faithful to his memory. What can Bux do? The creed of his master came in conflict with the creed of the Indian politicians. Bux had to choose between the two. If he chose his master's creed, he would have been true to truth and to his master alike. But he would have had no following and he would have to cry in the wilderness. If he took to politics, numbers were at his beck and call. What does it matter where the truth lay? What does it matter where the vital centres of Indian life lay? It matters absolutely nothing. Politics

is power. It carries everything before it. It is the sunshine in which every one wants to bask. It is the stage on which every one wants to play. It is the easy and smooth downward course for India just like the children sitting at the top of the rock and sliding down through the smooth and sloping granite surface. Whereas the creed of Ranade is uphill work. The ascent is very like climbing the Himalayan heights to reach the Everest. A popular falsehood is better than an unpopular truth. The world is too bad to be true. It always likes masks and masquerades. It prefers the bubble on the water to the water itself. It prefers fancy to fact. It prefers the fitful rainbow and the fleeting wind to the blue expanse of the skies and the stately calm. In short, it runs after shadows in utter disregard of the substance.

A.—Do you mean to say that Bux does not know his own mind? Does he not know what is really good for the country? Do you mean to say that he has sacrificed truth for popularity? And that he is following the political Will-'o-the-wisp contrary to his master's commands? I am afraid you are hardly fair to Bux. May he not think that politics must lead and the solution of social problems will follow?

R.—He may think so. But in that case he would be differing from Ranade radically. Politics and Ethics!! Take your own party politics of England. We know just as much about your politics as you know perhaps about our Indian life. But the one thing we know about British politics is that you are swinging round and round like the spider in its web in your whirlpool of party politics. The great British nation is like so many chips of wood caught in this whirlpool going round the pivot

of party politics. I am not quite sure whether the British Parliamentary system of Government is, after all, the best in the world, though you seem to think that what has been so good for England must be good everywhere. It may not follow at all. Each country may have to evolve its own form of Government instead of being dragged willy-nilly into any particular form as if there is any inherent virtue in mere forms apart from the conditions of the peoples to which they are suited. The form of Government best suited to a people is after all but a human contrivance, and it is nothing but a struggle to adapt itself to the conditions and requirements of the people from time to time. To be successful, it must be more a growth from within than an imposition from without. If you push a man too much from behind, the chances are one may fall over the other and both get hurt by the fall. It is this that is not realised by those generous and well-meaning politicians who are known by the name of Radicals in England. Some think that the British Parliament is better than the British public. But the truth is perhaps the other way. The British public is better than the British Parliament. That may account for the greatness of the British notwithstanding their Parliamentary system of Government. For what does Parliament after all amount to? It is nothing but Party Spirit, Opposition Benches, endless talk and little action. The English nation appears to consist of two portions: One being the ruling, living and working portion which educates, trades, colonises, fights, conquers and consolidates, and the other which assembles in Parliament and talks. It is a wise division of labour that the minority of the British nation possessing means, leisure and intellect

should go into this wonderful assembly to do all the talking; while the rest of the nation is doing all the working, and as long as the real nation is allowed to do its work, no great harm can be done by the Parliament. Parliament is a great institution for preventing the intellect of the country from getting rusty. Besides, the phlegmatic British must cultivate the art of speaking and Parliament is the place for it. The best way of improving the art of speaking is to have a Debating House and Opposition Bench and two or more parties, to oppose each other tooth and nail. To add zest and point to the fight, the party which wins most of the units to its side must be in power in order that the opposite party may pound it away and get into its place. The Parliamentary system is like two wrestlers who are constantly trying to throw each other down and the British Parlimentary arena is now getting more complicated and more confusing than ever before. Where Whig and Tory fought before, we find now Liberals, Conservatives, Unionists, Labourites, Home Rulers, etc. What with the Socialists and Labourities and the uprooting of the House of Lords, the British Parliament is very like a building round the crater of a volcano which is rumbling and thundering, exploding and throwing up its red-hot lava. It looks as if the British Parliament just now is on the eve of a collapse or chaos. There is one ray of hope about it, that it has been evolved, with all its defects, out of the genius of the British which may yet save it in time. But there is absolutely no reason to inflict it on every part of the globe as if it were the political panacea without which every country in the world will sicken and die. It is as suited to the fighting,

pugilistic and political genius of the British, as it is opposed to the calm, philosophical and spiritualising genius of the East.

A.—I confess I am a Radical Reformer. The Radicals believe that they have a great mission, and that is, of hoisting the flag of political freedom all over the world. That is what the world is tending to. You see how even China is waking; how Japan has beaten Russia and so India is waking too. England should only feel proud of India becoming free under her domination. It is for effecting that freedom that England is here. That is what I should think. The world is marching towards freedom and it is the duty of each country and each nation to help the world towards that fruition. But as one who has been a practical administrator in India for nearly a quarter of a century, I quite agree with you that a free or self-governing form of Government is a thing to be gradually achieved by the people instead of being imposed on them. But don't you think that Lord Morley's scheme was just in time to save the country? Don't you think that in that scheme lies shadowed forth the political liberation of India? Don't you think broadly speaking, that between Monarchy and Democracy, Democracy is the better form of Government, and that therefore England is only doing the right thing to give India that form in which it believes itself. We give you our best, but if that fails it is not our fault. England cannot but believe in a Parliamentary form of Government as about the best for the world.

R.—" For forms of Government, let fools contest,
Whatever is best administered, is best."

This couplet contains one view of Government. Democracy is the other view. You may call the first view

Monarchy or any modified form of it. But it is essentially monarchical. The genius of Indian polity is and has been essentially monarchical. I quite believe with you that the world-spirit to-day is making for freedom in a sense. But the great question is "What is freedom? How is it attained? A great Frenchman, the author of a book on Vedantism, who has seen India and spent a long time here, wrote to me thus about that grossly ill-used word—freedom. He said "I was in India from 1871 to 1895, and love both the country and the people. Above all, I love and venerate the Indian sacred writings.................I am now living in a country where the ideas of liberty, brotherhood and equality may almost be called a national passion. Yet with all the high qualities of the French and their wonderful intelligence, I find as little real liberty here as there is in Germany. I rather look upon liberty as a thing realizable only by a people which should have attained its highest potentialities, *moral greatness and perfect self-respect.* "Moral greatness," that is the basis, which means a high national character.

Mark, Mr. A. Hight said this in his letter of the 13th September, 1906, from France. . That letter is well worth quoting in full, which I shall do later on. Mark the opinion of this eminent author who is a great friend of India and whose book "The Unity of Will" may well be called a book on Vedantism.

Hegel says that progress is nothing but the assertion of the universal spirit step by step and stage by stage towards freedom, but Hegel strangely enough condemned the East to eternal political bondage because of the social and religious conditions in which he found the East. Hegel was no doubt guilty of self-contradiction when he

defined progress as instinct with *the universal spirit*, but denied it *to half the world*. But we must note that however bitter Hegel's condemnation may be to we Indians, still he wrote what he thought and felt honestly, because of the conditions of the East. He felt that they were so unprogressive, dreamy and immobile that political freedom was impossible in India and in the East generally. While Hegel's condemnation is overdrawn, and his conclusion is over-generalisation, we cannot overlook the truth underlying Hegel's observation as applicable to India even to this day. True, as you said, marvellous is the progress made by India under the British Government. If Hegel were writing now about India he would write differently. He would perhaps say " East is to be freed by the West" instead of saying as he has done, " East is never to be freed."

Modern Japan would have sufficed to upset Hegel's conclusion. But ancient Japan was quite different from India in several essential respects, and so modern Japan was evolved easily enough out of ancient Japan, and even that only after a great and mighty national training under the British, and rigid national culture on the lines of the West. Japan is a small island, compact and well-knit, and with the spirit of freedom warming her blood all along her history. Nevertheless, there was a moment when Japan might perhaps have blundered egregiously from which however it was nothing but the genius of *The Mikado* that saved it. Those who would worship the multitude and the Hydra-headed Demos would do well to remember that what saved Japan at the most critical hour in her history was her Monarch and not *Demos*. The theory that half-a-dozen men are likely to give wiser counsel

than one man, which is the basis of democracy, is not true at all times and in all countries. It is true only in certain stages of the history of the world and in certain stages of advancement of the people. At other times and in other stages the truth is just the other way.

It is more easy to find one wise man or a few wise men to rule the destinies of millions rather than find materials enough for building a democracy upon. If only *The Mikado* had not with rare prescience seen that the British must be first studied before they are opposed, the position of Japan to-day would have been unenviable. It was again the one man Mikado and not the many men of Japan, who with a rare breadth of mind and freedom from prejudice sent his Ambassadors all over the world to find out what was best in the world, in every branch of knowledge and science, art and life, and it was once more the Mikado, *the one man*, who issued edict after edict, throwing overboard all the cargo of baneful custom and deadening unprogressiveness, to a loyal and patriotic people who obeyed their monarch willingly and implicitly. Thus Japan in spite of her great natural and national advantages, *unlike India*, had to make large sacrifices for the common good in a truly national spirit under a wise monarch, before she could become the "England of the East" and the "Wonder of the World." But never has more nonsense been spoken in India by dreamers and visionaries than when they mistake India for Japan and talk of the two countries as if they were alike. But I do not mean for a moment that India alone is to lag behind when even China is progressing. Oh, no. All that I mean is that the Indian problem of political freedom is not so easy to grasp as you Radicals would have it. It has

to be studied in the light of other root-problems of Indian life and Indian conditions. No one has cared to study it in that light. Yet that is the only true light in which it can be studied.

A.—You must explain yourself a bit, please.

R.—Yes, I am sorry I have not made myself clear enough. I assert in the first place that democracy is not necessarily the best form of Government in the world. Secondly, I assert granting that it is the best form, it can be achieved only by a process of social and intellectual freedom on which alone it can be built safely. And thirdly, I assert that in India the introduction of democracy would mean a life-and-death struggle for the ancient Indian civilization, the result of which no one can foresee. But one thing is certain, that the political genius of India and the genius of her language, literature and religion are all a direct antithesis to the spirit of democracy. If the genius of India were to build her own political future, it will not be on democratic lines. How far it is a gain to India and the world alike to make a terrible sacrifice of all that is dear to her in her ancient wisdom, is a great question. How far India is really going to assimilate the democracy of the West, is a great problem. If India did effect the change to democracy, how far it is going to profit her in the long run, is a great doubt. England would have the melancholy satisfaction perhaps of having destroyed India in all that was good, noble and enduring in her, leaving in its place a demoralising democracy, drunk with corruption and brute force, bearing perhaps a very close resemblance to the small French dependency here.

A.—You mean Pondicherry?

R.—Yes: If you want to see the experiment on Indian soil, you need only go to Pondicherry. It has been long enough there, and it is quite a tiny and small enough place to try the experiment with the concentrated wisdom of the French Revolution, the warmth and fervour of the great French nation and their democratic war-cry.—" Liberty, Fraternity and Equality." What is the result? The less said the better. But the French are not to blame for it. They gave Pondicherry their best form of Government as *they* knew it in France. They gave it as free as their flowing wine just as Radicals are trying to push us into Radicalism in all earnestness and sincerity. Yet the worst critics of British Government in India dare not say to-day that Pondicherry is better governed. Why? Because the form of Government was not suited to the genuis of the people. Again let me tell you that the fault does not rest with the French. Where you expected to transplant France in Pondicherry and raise Pondicherry up to the level of France, you have only succeeded in producing a Pondicherry which is neither Indian, nor French. The reason is, as I have been trying to show, a mere form of Government when it is not evolved from the conditions of the people, but when it is merely imposed upon them may not only do no good but may possibly do harm. Freedom has two aspects—the subjective and the objective. In its objective aspect, it represents the desire for liberation from external control. In its subjective aspect, it implies a certain amount of minimum virtue and intelligence *in the mass*, as the ground-work on which alone it can stand. This ground-work which may be called broadly, *the national virtues* are largely in the

free countries and nations of the West. For instance, in the Boer War, every Englishman far and away from the scene, was feeling the victory of the British, as *his*, and was likewise feeling every defeat as a blow to *him*. Even so, would Frenchmen do, Americans do, and Germans do under similar circumstances. Because, the national feeling has long since come to dominate each of these countries and nations, and it is on that national feeling mainly that the free and self-governing character of the French, the English or the German depends, whatever might be the strong or weak points in the internal administration. Even so, in America, when the war of Independence was declared, there was first the national feeling which prompted it, and it was the national feeling that carried it along the lines against the mother country. But for that national feeling, there would be no upbuilding of American freedom. There would have been no upbuilding of the present form of American Government. Democracy in one form or another derives its life and continuity from this national feeling as its perennial fountain. And where that national feeling has yet to be built as in India, the great problem is whether nation-making is the first thing so as to build democracy on it safely, or whether it should be an imposition of democracy, leaving the nation-making severely alone. They are two different things. Where there is a nation and where nation-making has been done, there democracy is not only easy but even an inevitable outcome. But where it has yet to be done, democracy can only sit as a heavy dead-weight. You see the term "*Indian*" does not evoke in the mind of all Indians the same feeling which the term Frenchman evokes in the French,

Englishman evokes in the English or American evokes in the American. "*Indian*" is yet a word which evokes no particular feeling because it is yet too vague and too high to touch any one among the multitudinous divisions of Indians. It is the *divisions* that are alive and in full swing. The word Indian is yet nebulous and vague. If instead of using the word "Indian," you use the names of the divisions, they evoke a feeling. "The Mahomedan," "the Christian," "the Parsee," these evoke the feelings of the particular classes. But even the word "Hindu" is only a little less vague than the word "Indian," but all the same, it yet evokes not much feeling. But if you use instead the names of the particular divisions of Hindus, you touch a chord of each division. If you allude to the "Brahman," you have touched a chord, though here again, you have to remember how much the feeling is attenuated by the numerous divisions of brahmans, and so, the general name "Indian" is unmeaning and vague. If you particularise "the brahman" through his divisions, you touch a deeper chord. Even so, if you allude to non-brahman, you are still in the region of vagueness. You must particularise still further. Go down again to the other classes lower down in the scale like the millions of what are termed the depressed classes. There is any amount of room for particularising even among them, Where you have thousands and thousands of small circles and big circles into which the millions of India are grouped and divided, each with its own centre round which it moves, you have got ever so many circles of class feeling, sect feeling, race feeling, religious feeling, etc., which are perpetually making for *anti-national feeling*

so nnlike the national feeling of the West. All these innumerable circles so long as they persist and live, are all, if correctly viewed, so many powerful centres of *anti-national feeling*. We have not only not got national feeling in India, but we have got ever so many centres round which anti-national feeling is perpetually revolving. A form of Government suited only to the national feeling must be unsuited to such anti-national centres which represent the real life of the great Indian continent. You may say that democracy is powerful enough to destroy the anti-national centres and bring about national feeling in course of time. But with equal force, I may point out that it is just as possible that in the conflict between the nationalising tendency of democracy and the anti-national centres of Indian life, *which* is going to win, will depend on the strength of the one as against the other. If the anti-national centres are strong enough and would not yield, then democracy will fail. At any rate, those who would see national feeling gain the victory must show how far the anti-national centres are yielding under the touch of national feeling. It appears to me that the anti-national centres are yielding after all as little as ever to-day. And unless and until they yield and disappear, the very basis for democracy would be wanting; and throwing democracy in the meanwhile as a huge experiment in India would be certainly putting the cart before the horse. Which is the better method? To prepare the ground and then to build on it or build first and then look to the ground on which you have built,—which is as absurd and ruinous a method of building as you can think of.

A.—Do you mean to tell me then, that the nationalising forces are not working now in India? If so, it would be the severest condemnation of the British rule for half a century. Look at the National Congress for 23 years where all India meets: look at the Conferences, political, social and industrial where again all India meets. Look at the spirit of co-operation all over the country as shown in the co-operative credit societies, which have shown such marvellous capacity for work during a very short time of their existence. Look at the District Conferences, social and political. The spirit of combination and co-operation is quite in the air. Trade Unions, Commercial Unions, in fact, Unions and Associations of almost every interest big or small, appear to be the order of the day. It is quite clear to my mind, comparing the India of to-day with the India as it was 25 years ago, that you are now passing through the most interesting stage of progress. One feels the touch of new life everywhere. At one time it looked as if you would not move on quick enough, but now it looks as if you are moving on too rapidly. It looks already as if India has entered from the Agricultural into the Industrial stage of civilisation. Indian trade and commerce are showing signs of fresh vitality and strength. Indians are going to England, America and Japan. Don't you think on the whole that the forces of unification and co-operation in India to-day have been steadily and rapidly on the increase under the British rule and that they point to nationalising India as the purpose. Don't you think that the forces of unification are on the whole more powerful to-day than the forces of disruption in India? Don't you think that India has been drawn willy-nilly into the vortex of the

world's civilization and that she has therefore no option or choice in the matter, but to adopt the western modes of thought and Government and that the sooner she does so, the better.

R.—That is what is exactly happening. But what is happening may not be for the best. Democracy, as I said, is not necessarily the best form of Government and now let me say the Industrial civilization of the West is not the best civilization either. And both are opposed to the genius of Indian polity and Indian civilization, and when left to herself, India will never keep your democracy or your Industrial civilization. The Industrial civilization of the West with its inevitable tendency to accumulate wealth on one side, and accentuate poverty on the other, is not, after all, the highest civilization, to be sure. It is a civilization which brings in its train labour strikes and dynamite, Fenianism and drink. It certainly needs mending somewhere. It has nothing in it akin to the civilization in India. Indian civilization is built on the basis of contentment and every man doing his duty to others and looking on the pricks of life as due to Karma. But the western civilization is built upon the basis of rights and ambitions wherein every one hopes to become somebody some time and none will accept anything as inevitable. In the western civilization there is more kicking against the pricks of life than in the Indian civilization. In the West, people are everything. But here in India, individuals are everything, and the people nothing. In the West, office is nothing, but wealth is everything, but here office is everything and wealth nothing before power. In the West, the King-Emperor may pass through the streets unnoticed, and Gladstone might be pulling up a cart side by side with

coolies unknown and unnoticed. But in India it cannot happen. Under the British Government the element of personal rule is infinitely less than under the Oriental Government. Whereas to this day, the element of personal rule is infinitely more in the Native States than in the British Government. The Native States do not believe in democracy. They dread it, because the idea of sovereign or king in India is that *He* is the source of all power. Whereas the idea of popular government is that the *People* are the source of all power. The most enlightened of Indian princes may vie with each other in bringing up their dominions to the highest level of progress on modern lines. But none of them would give a particle of power to the people as such. Baroda may educate under compulsion its subjects. Mysore may give education to the girls. Travancore may develop culture and refinement in their womenkind. And they may indulge in feeble imitations of a mere shadow of the popular form of government like the Representative Assembly of Mysore or the Srimulam Assembly of Travancore merely to satisfy the *amour propre* of British Government. It is nothing more than a compliment paid to the British. They do not mean to adopt it themselves. On the other hand, while they feel that they are dragged into imitating the ways of the British, they have an uneasy consciousness that the British are introducing a very dangerous element in introducing democracy which might spread like a contagion and place them at the mercy of *Demos*, one day or other. They would rather cease to exist than divide power with the people, much less wipe themselves out by admitting the democratic doctrine that the people are the source of all power. In Mysore care is taken by the

Dewan to sound the note every time to the Representative Assembly, that they ought not to mistake their position and that they are there not as a matter of right but merely as a matter of grace, and that they are there not to control or guide the ruling power, but merely to represent *humbly* their wishes and grievances. I do not for a moment think that the Native States are thankful at all to Lord Morley's scheme, because the underlying principle would sooner or later mean a death blow to their sovereign power. At any rate, it is foreign to the genius of Indian polity.

You must remember that the Native States in India cover a considerable portion of the country and rule over millions of people. They are all modelled on the monarchical system. The blood in their veins is monarchical to the core. They believe in aristocracy. They believe in the aristocracy of blood, in the aristocracy of birth, and in the aristocracy of caste. Rudyard Kipling has hit the truth in Sir Puram Doss that the Indian genius is philosophical and that the Indian alone can accomplish the feat of severing himself from the world in one strange and inexplicable moment in the midst of power and wealth. The genius of India is religious, and it may take strange forms. The Indian Maharajah or the Indian Dewan who has drunk deep from the fountain of English life and English literature and who looks upon English civilization as the best going, and who denounces caste as most corroding to national life may come across a Brahman saint or Sanyasi one day and at once the convictions of a life are upset and he becomes the docile disciple of the Brahman. Yes, that is India; or a Mahomedan Fakir goes about preaching Vedantism. He is canonised, and at

his tomb even Brahmans may worship. That is India again. While our Native States are all fired now with the new ambition to bring up their States to the highest level of modern excellence, they are conscious in doing so only of reviving the best form of ancient Indian monarchy, and they do not in their heart of hearts think of opening Houses of Parliament which might soon reduce them to the position of mere figureheads. Already it was supposed in Mysore that the Advisory Committee is only a contrivance to do away with the Representative Assembly. And His Highness, the Maharajah, has had to re-assure the public mind against the suspicion. The ideal Indian monarchy looks to the King as the source of all power, but he may at will have his own council of notables to help him which is as far away from a Parliamentary form of Government as Heaven from Earth.

It is a mistake to suppose that the progress of Native States under the guidance of British rule and on the model of British Government has anything of the democratic touch or basis in it. On the other hand, they appear to me to be already shrewd enough to observe and dread the democratic current in Lord Morley's scheme, and to be carefully providing against its influx into their own dominions. They are busy raising embankments against it. They are, in fact, already giving form and shape to their conviction that without democracy they can develop the best form of Government in their own States, by way of proving to the British in the fulness of time the blunder they are committing. Monarchy in its best form is now developing in the Native States so as to prove a powerful antithesis to Lord Morley's experiment in British India.

I am afraid you have not read the signs of the times aright, when you tell me that the present day forces in British India are all towards nationalising. I do not believe it one bit. It is a great delusion to suppose any such thing. On the other hand what is happening in British India under the guise of nationalising is merely the development of each of the multifarious anti-national centres to their utmost possible strength and fitness. Each circle is only developing its own strength without meaning to break the circumference or flow into the common mass. No: the Mahomedans are strengthening themselves without meaning to coalesce with the Hindus. Hindus are likewise strengthening themselves without meaning to coalesce with the Mahomedans. And among the Hindus themselves, the various classes and sections are each one of them strengthening and developing its own small sectional life as a matter of mere self-defence, self-protection and survival in the great race of progress that has been set on foot. The race for life and living has become terribly keen, and each class and each community is girding up the loins and trying to run as fast as it could so that it might not be left behind in the race. And the co-operation and combination you see to-day is nothing but this race of the numerous divisions and classes in India with each other. This is no more than a running race of classes and class interests at best. There is nothing national in it. Mysore for Mysore, Baroda for Baroda, Travancore for Travancore, province for province, Maratta for Maratta, sect for sect, etc., is the real key-note of the situation. Did you note the reactionary forces like the Adwaita Sabha, the Madhwa Sabha, the Brahman Conference, the

Non-brahman Conference, the Okkilia Conference, the Devangari Conference, Ceded Districts Conference, the Northern Sirkars Conference, the Telugu Conference, the Tamil Sangam, the Malabar Conference, the Christian Conventions, the Nadar Unions, etc. Each of these appears to be acting under a sort of panic, that if they did not each one assert its own sectional life as against the rest, it might be sunk. The co-operative movements are purely economical or industrial as a sheer necessity, in the struggle for existence without meaning to change or divert the main currents of Indian life. Indian art is reviving; Indian industries are reviving; Indian agriculture is improving. In fact, we are witnessing a great revival in India of all the lost or forgotten arts and industries, but without affecting in any appreciable degree the main *anti-national* centres of life. In fact, the spirit of revival and reaction is a powerful indication that India is developing on its own old lines of monarchy and aristocracy. The brahman does not mean to merge himself in the non-brahman. The non-brahman does not mean to merge himself in the lower classes. The Hindu does not mean to merge himself in the Mahomedan, nor does the Mahomedan mean to merge himself in the Hindu. Among the Native Christians, the great problem of the day is to remove caste from among them. Are you aware of the numerous divisions of Indian Christians who would not intermarry? Are you aware of caste Christians who would not give up their castes? Are you aware of the bitter feuds between Vellala Christians and Nadar Christians? And how much more bitter they are towards each other than towards other communities? Are you aware of the numerous divisions among Mahomedans?

The sectarian spirit of Southern India is to-day not only as powerful as ever, but is even developing strongly on sectarian lines. Each sect feels itself elevated in the rise of its own men, but does not feel equally so in the rise of other sects. Have you noted that inter-marriages among the various sects of Brahmans or various sub-divisions of Non-brahmans is still a very distant hope. Did you notice the fierce war of Madras *versus* Mysore in the Mysore politics? And that while Madras and Mysore may marry, the feeling of Madras *versus* Mysore is still keen and unabated, when it comes to a question of power and office. One must study these great under-currents of sociology and how they cross each other and oppose each other. They have not the slightest idea of giving way to each other, or sacrificing themselves for the great ideal of nationalism; a fact which Englishmen even here cannot fully grasp; and they are taken in by appearances. As for Radicals at home they are only more ignorant of them and they are only too ready to be deceived into hasty and superficial generalizations of which every man in India capable of thinking is however aware. You must realise more than all that these tremendous currents and counter-currents of Indian life present a smooth surface under the spell of British rule which is constantly throwing its charm of peace and unity and that the moment the spell is withdrawn, the mutually antagonistic anti-national centres of Indian life will be left mercilessly to a state of internecine and internal war which will reduce India in a second to its condition during the pre-British days from which it will have no means of recovering so far as humam eye can see or imagination can picture. The globe-trotting M.Ps.

who write up their books for the edification of the British public are quite innocent of the real life of India or the real difficulties of nationalising India. While the Indians themselves do not mean to do it and have not begun doing it as yet, is it not ridiculous for the Radicals at home to think of doing it at the point of their generous vapourings printed in London and spread broadcast all over the world? Every foreigner who comes to India and goes back has now come to adopt as his creed clever vituperation of the British administration holding up the British democracy as the great fruit from which the people of India are kept by the British officials here with the one sinister purpose of keeping down India and Indians. The British rule in India has made every nation in the west a bit jealous of England apparently. The American holds up the Philippine Islands for model. This is the latest by way of pointing out how the Philippinoes and Americans are fraternising with each other compared with the Indians and Englishmen. This is all cheap theorising and generalising but a great deal beside the mark. Americans cannot nationalise India, England cannot nationalise India. The example of Philippinoes can no more nationalise India than France nationalised Pondicherry. India alone can nationalise itself, but if she does not mean to do it, no one can push her into it.

A.—I admit that India is a labyrynth difficult to unravel. I admit the force of your contention. But what about the social reform movement which at least you will admit is a distinctly nationalising force? What do you think of the Arya Samaj which is nationalising? What do you say to Brahma Samaj which is nationalising?

You have not taken note of Theosophy which is bringing together the various religions on common ground and trying to make people forget their difference and emphasise their unity. You have also forgotten to take note of Free Masonry which is again a great factor in bringing the east and west together. Don't you think that caste is visibly crumbling before this force? Don't you think that the next step after these innumerable divisions get strengthened, each in its own way, will be towards a general coalition making for Indian nationality.

R.—Yes, I do believe in the Social Reform Movement. But so far, the country has not responded to its call sufficiently. Similar movements like the Arya Samaj and Brahma Samaj have again failed to rouse the enthusiasm of the country. As for Theosophy, while it has softened the religious animosities *in theory*, it has unfortunately made so far every sect and every class believe only in itself as about the best, and has never roused itself equal to the call of universal brotherhood, which has so far remained a mere name. If the country had only responded to this larger call hitherto, you can place some hope in these forces. Unfortunately, the larger calls have been cries in the wilderness, and the classes and sects have been and are asserting to-day their own vicious and selfish cries to the detriment of the national life. How this is going to disappear is more than I can say.

A.—Is not Social Reform a success? Mr. Veerasalingham is a hero of a hundred re-marriages which have stirred up the Sirkars into reform activity. In Bombay, Hindu ladies, Parsee ladies and even Mahomedan ladies

have come to take part in social movements in an inspiring manner. The Poona Widows' Home is the flower of the reform movement. The depressed classes mission is another great and encouraging feature of the nationalising tendency and Gokhale's Elementary Education Bill, if passed and worked out by the country, would render democracy inevitable.

R.—That is where the greatest mistake is made. You connect every accident of modern civilization with democracy as its necessary concomitant or the invariable cause. There is nothing incongruous between the most absolute form of monarchy and the best form of mass education, the best form of female education and the highest development of arts and industries. Because the American President shakes hands with his cabman who is holding his reins with one hand and a newspaper in the other, and because America has so much that is great and good in it, it does not in the least follow that the greatness and goodness of America is the result and the American President's shaking hands with his cabman is the cause. May not the connection between the two be merely one of co-existence instead of being causal? Do you think during the best days of monarchy all the world over under great and wise kings and monarchs, the people were not happy, the country was not prosperous, or the arts and industries did not flourish? On the other hand, it is one of the most deeply rooted articles of faith in the Indian mind that under a just and wise monarch, the people attained the highest eminence and prosperity all round. Indian history, Indian religion, Indian mythology and even Indian fables and stories are full of this faith. The king was everything to his people and the

country and its subjects everything to him. The conception of a just rule is so high in India that under it no injustice can happen, no tear can be shed and no wrong perpetrated. The king was responsible for anything and everything amiss in his country. Under a just rule there was no widowhood and no premature death. The greatest of the Tamil poets describing the country under Rama during his reign says with even more wisdom than poetry that " there was no wealth in the land because there was no poverty: that there was no strength in the land because there was no weakness: that there was no truthfulness in the land because there was no lying, and that there was no ignorance in the land because debates and discussions were the order of the day." Therefore it is obvious that the happiness of the people could be secured as much under the form of government known as monarchy as under any other, provided the instruments of government are efficient. But if the people would prefer one form of government to another and of which a Parliamentary form becomes an integral part, it pre-supposes the efficiency and fitness of the people who ask for it. It is for the people to adjust themselves up to the necessary state of fitness and efficiency before demanding it; this pre-supposes again a number of conditions, which not only happen to be wanting in India, but which are strenuously opposed to the existing Indian conditions. Unless, therefore, the existing conditions are largely changed and the requisite conditions for a popular form of government are initiated instead by the people, there is no meaning in thrusting on the country a form of government for which it is not yet prepared. It will never become a part of the people though it may

work in a way so long as the foreign hand works it. *It would be wise for the British Government and the people alike to agree frankly to working up first and foremost, those antecedent conditions of fitness before building up the popular form of government on a large scale.*

A.—I quite agree that there is a great deal of truth in what you say. But how would you work those conditions up? How would you have the people work them, and how would you ask the British Government to help them? Before proceeding to discuss that topic, I should like to know what you think about the policy and principles of British Government hitherto and why there has been such an amount of outburst of feeling against the British Government of late? How do you account for the school of sedition in India? What do you think generally of the effects of the British rule? Do you think the people have grown tired of the British Government and want a change? These are the questions which are troubling the British public. The British public would have an honest and impartial view of the situation from the purely Indian point of view.

CHAPTER II.

INDIA

AND

A Parliamentary Form of Government.

R.—Before we resume our discussion on the questions you have raised, let me make the observation that a Parliamentary form of Government is suited only to a free and self-governing nation or at any rate, there must be a certain amount of minimum solidarity and social unity of thought and feeling among the people before the experiment could be tried. History has no parallel to the system of British Government in India, because never before was so large a tract of country which consists of diverse peoples and religions ruled by a single sovereign power—and that a foreign power, whose home is separated from India by thousands of miles of sea. Before talking of Philippinoes under America, we would do well to know what are the social customs and divisions of the Philippinoes, and if they are anything like those obtaining in India. False analogies must lead to incorrect generalizations. If Lord Morley, Mr. Ramsay Macdonald, Mr. Keir Hardie and the scores of foreign tourists and visitors to India, could only have a clear grasp of the Indian conditions of life and living and the Indian customs and manners of thought and feeling, before inditing their criticisms or

drafting schemes for the political uplifting of India, their views would be helpful to progress on right lines. I wish Charles Bradlaugh had tackled the Indian social problem. I wish we had a Herbert Spencer or John Stuart Mill to think out the Indian sociology and write on Indian social liberty. I wish Lord Morley could come to India and live with us for a few years and try to understand Indian life.

If the spirit of democracy were introduced too soon, even where the Government is by the people's own monarch, it will tend to revolution. But when it comes gradually as in England, to give the country the best form of limited monarchy, it is safe, because the people, the Parliament, and the King are all of the same nationality. There is no incompatibility therefore between intense love for the sovereign on the part of the people and an intense love for a constitutional system of government. The stability of the government or the safety of the King is never at stake on account of the constitutional liberty of the Parliament. Even the gravest constitutional crisis may therefore come and go in England, leaving no great danger behind for the nation or the country at large, because the nation facing the crisis and the nation coming out of it is one and the same, and it is a matter of national self-interest to see that the nation comes out of the struggle whole and unhurt. But when one nation rules over another as England is ruling India, the function of a Parliamentary form of government becomes radically different, in that while in the British Parliament it is only the parties that are opposing each other and nobody is opposing the King or the Government as a whole, in India the subject of opposition is not this party or that, but the British Government itself. In the British

Parliament the fight is between the party in power and the party out of power. Both being English, it becomes merely a great political game, and no danger can come out of it affecting the stability of the constitution. But in India the party in power is the British Government, and it is the party *perpetually* in power, and when it is opposed by the party out of power *perpetually*, the result can be nothing like the British Parliament, but can only be that the ruling power is perpetually under the fire of criticism at the hands of the party out of power. It is only where a form of party Government could be instituted that a Parliamentary form of Government could be inaugurated. And this is possible only when the rulers and the ruled belong to the same nationality. Otherwise the obvious result will be that the difficulties incidental to a foreign Government would be not only multiplied endlessly and without sufficient cause, but the very stability of the Government is constantly undermined by the habit of attack against it which the Government itself has engendered by introducing the Parliamentary form. It is most remarkable that this aspect has never been taken note of and Indian politics is discussed by the politicians both here and at home just as they would discuss British politics, overlooking the fact that the same course of criticism which in England would be not only harmless but might be only a phase of party politics to which the nation is accustomed all along, would in India lead to shaking the very foundations of the British Government, because what the Opposition Bench in India is attacking is not any party, but the Government itself. It is not merely, as in England, the party in power that is ridiculed, that is exposed, that is weakened,

that is discredited or defeated making room for the other party to come in, but what is attacked, what is ridiculed, what is exposed, what is discredited and what is defeated is for the moment the Government itself. If a party form of Government could be possibly evolved for British India as the one in England which would leave the Sovereign power untouched and unaffected, there would be no great danger to the stability of the British rule. But as long as this is not possible, this form of government is obviously unsuited where one nation rules another, because it amounts to creating a state of affairs never intended either by the rulers or the ruled. I do not think the British politician of any school, however Radical, is anxious that the British should retire from India to-morrow. But yet he is strengthening by his criticisms unconsciously the impression in India that the British Government is something so wicked and heinous that the sooner it retires the better. While the Radical thinks that his honest criticism of Indian Government is merely to mend it in his own Parliamentary fashion, he scarcely realises that the millions of India unaccustomed to the Parliamentary form, only take criticism to mean that he is willing to contribute another axe to be laid at the very root of the British Government. The Indians on the other side who represent the party in opposition, must come to the conclusion by a simple process of reasoning that so long as they have no power to carry on the Government themselves on the lines of the Parliamentary system at home, this sort of mere form must only lead to discontent and helplessness. It can only lead gradually to a perfected system of attack against the British rule which would widen and deepen

the impression already set afloat that the British Government is a failure. That this is what is happening, there can be no doubt.

A.—The British nation would certainly be astonished to hear that the criticism at home has the effect of undermining the faith of the people in the British rule. They rather think that they are strengthening the bonds between India and England, but if the result is unfortunately, as you say, then it is time that that method of criticism was dropped and some other method of criticism adopted.

R.—Yes, that is exactly the danger of the situation. You see the British Government is in its very nature exposed to great difficulties. No true well-wisher of India and England should add to them. In the first place, it must be conceded that the first and foremost feature of the British Government, unlike its predecessors in India, is that the ruling power does not reside in the country it rules. Those who conquered India or any part of it, one after another, during all the political vicissitudes through which India had passed before the British ascendency, made India their home so that the rulers and the ruled were really together. This guaranteed touch between the rulers and the ruled. But the British from the beginning have been, so to speak, absentee rulers. They come and go. They do not reside amidst the people they rule. This perhaps accounts for a great deal more of aloofness of Englishmen from Indians than anything else. Then again the British Empire, though the biggest in the world and the most marvellous too, has not got in India any sovereign whom the people could cling to with the devotion and warmth of oriental

nature. Is it not very extraordinary when you come to think of it that the millions of Indian subjects should have no sovereign in their own land in flesh and blood but that he should be visible to us only in pictures? Had Her Majesty the Queen Victoria spent a quarter of her reign in India, I have no doubt the devotion to the British Sovereign would to-day be a thousand-fold stronger. It is human nature more or less. If the British Sovereign were in India all the time and not seen in England, I am sure it would affect the public mind of England just as much as now the people of India are affected by want of a visible Sovereign. M. Chailley says:—

> "Indian loyalty is like a bird which finds no rest for its feet. It was a comprehension of this that inspired Disraeli, in 1875, with the happy thought of making Queen Victoria Empress of India. But why, it is said, not go farther? why not give India a member of the Royal Family as a sub-king? The people would respect him because he would be powerful, and would love him because they would have found a worthy object of love. The British alone can decide whether such a solution is feasible or desirable."

Thirdly, nobody knows where the centre of British Government lies. Is it in India or in England? Is it in the Local Government, or Indian Government or the Secretary of State or the British Parliament or the British public? Nobody knows were the centre is. It is in the Local Government and yet it is not. It is in the India Government and yet it is not. It is in the Secretary of State and yet it is not there either. It is in the British Parliament and it is not quite there. It is in the British public, but

what does the British public know of India? Thus British Government in India has got ever so many centres that one does not know which is the real centre. The rulers and statesmen who come to India and rule are a perpetually shifting factor. They come and go, and their place is taken up by others. They come and go back to their far-off native isle. To the Anglo-Indian rulers and administrators, their work in India is a part of the history of India, and to all good Britishers India has become dear as the scene of their labours and when they bid good-bye to India it is with a heavy heart. But yet it is sad to reflect that India is not their home and they have to go. If only half of our rulers and statesmen should look to India as their home, there would be to-day more touch undoubtedly between the rulers and the ruled. While thus the British rule in India is the marvel of marvels, it is like a huge kaleidoscope turning from England to India and back again to England in a manner unprecedented in the annals of history. A colony of Englishmen in India composed of retired officials or even a part of the retired officials who would look to India, if not as their home, at least as the land of their adoption would be a great bridge between the East and the West. The amount of intellectual and moral wealth that comes to India from England every year in the shape of Englishmen and goes away without stopping here to lift up India is the real drain that we should deplore, and the best of them come and go like flashes of lightning after having acted their part on the stage of Indian administration.

A.—Yes: I quite see the point, but if Englishmen made India their home I am afraid they would soon

cease to be Englishmen and lose their power for good. They must preserve the freshness and vigour of their native island before they can be of any use to the world. That is why they send their children away to England early for training. The Englishmen whose sojourn in India is long, find themselves out of touch at home and so they hurry back to make amends. So the term Anglo-Indian means Englishman who has lost a bit of the English touch and gained a bit of Indian touch by his stay in India.

R.—You seem to be talking exactly like the Brahman who says that he loses his caste by touching the black waters or treading on the English soil. Whether Englishmen could make India their home or not is a problem for their own decision. But I, for one, look upon the difficulty as purely sentimental and as capable of solution. *If India is worth ruling, it must be worth living in.* What about the large number of missionaries who spend almost all their lives in India? However the question is yet in the region of speculation and not in that of practical politics. When we go to England and stop there as long as Englishmen do in India, we are bound to become a bit Anglicized; and even so Englishmen in India must get a bit Indianized. Perhaps we would get more Anglicized in England than Englishmen would be in India under existing conditions. That is inevitable. But there is no reason to dread it. It is said that Englishmen when they come to India are fresh, free, and frank, and that under Indian conditions they become what is termed Bureaucrats, but to the extent to which this is true Indian conditions are a great deal responsible. For the Anglo-Indian code of conduct in India the Indians will

have to bear their share of burden. We often hear the charge now-a-days that the Englishman in India is a bit of a Nawab. If it is so, may it not be that the Nawabism of India has affected even the simple and free Englishman?

Twenty years ago when the Collector was on tour in his District, he was received with a great deal of pomp and splendour, music and tom-tom, nautch girls and garlands and he was quite demi-godded and so he became a demi-god. It was not his fault surely. Even when he did not want it, the people demi-godded him. When the Collector went for Jamabandi, he was received like the Governor. I quite remember when I was a boy how a Collector was received in a Taluk Station when he went to Jamabandi. That again is Indian custom. What could the Collector do except to bow to the custom of the country he had to rule? Pomp and splendour attaching to power is a thing of the East, and it could be washed out only gradually even if Englishmen would put them out at once. The Collector who at one time loomed so big has now been shoved into the background. The Revenue Board has likewise gone into the background. The Local Government has likewise gone into the background. The Viceroy himself has had to recede before the Secretary of State and the Secretary of State in his turn, finds himself before the Parliament to answer questions. This must gladden the hearts of Radicals, but after all it is worth asking now after so much of Indian progress and enlightenment whence proceeds this Nawabism? From Indians or from Englishmen, and who is the bigger Bahadur, the Indian clothed with power or the Englishman? When the

Indian tries to become a free man, it is in spite of himself, his surroundings and traditions. That is why so few of the Indians even of the highest culture and eminence are still not free in any real sense of the term. And when the Englishman becomes the Nawab, it is again in spite of himself, his surroundings, his blood and his traditions. The result is that if you scratch the surface of the loudest Indian nationalist, you will find underneath Nawabism running in his veins. Likewise scratch the surface of the Anglo-Indian, he is essentially the free and freedom-loving Englishman. Nawabism in India is a concentric circle in which for centuries the Indian as well as the Mahomedan has been living. It is the normal political life of the country. The Village Officer plays the Nawab in the village. He is honoured in the village as its centre. His word is law in the village. While he exacts obeisance from his villagers he is cheerful in paying it in his turn to his Revenue Inspector or Tahsildar, who again in their turn are ready to pay it to their immediate superior, the Deputy Collector. Time was about twenty years ago when the Deputy Collector's arrival for Jamabandi was a great event. He was the centre of attraction only next to the Collector. Again the Deputy Collector gave the Collector the respect he got from his Tahsildar. It is so in Hyderabad. The Mahomedan says "give respect and take it." So round the small circle in the village of which the Headman or the Village Officer is the centre you come up by gradations until you reach the monarch at whose feet everything lay. This is India still. Similarly in the religious sphere you find the religious head of each community exacting implicit homage like the Pope in Rome. In the

social sphere, man has come to play the Nawab over the woman in India. In the domestic sphere, the husband plays the Nawab over the wife. As everyone in India must play the Nawab some time or other, the woman too wanted her chance, and that she got when she became a mother-in-law. So when the mother-in-law played the Nawab over the daughter-in-law, and when the latter grumbled, the mother-in-law said to the daughter-in-law "wait for your turn till you become a mother-in-law." Caste again is a huge aristocracy which tends to Nawabism of class over class. In this land therefore where the air is saturated so thoroughly with the spirit of Nawabism socially, religiously and politically, it would be a wonder if Englishmen were not affected by it more or less. But after all how much of it each takes is a question of personal equation. There are and there have been excellent men who have never been affected by it. There are again those who come to be so taken in by it honestly as the only thing that can rule India properly, and they readily remind one of the lines, "Assumes the God, affects to nod and seems to shake the spheres." Already this tendency has reached its climax, and it is no longer possible. This is Imperialism of the wrong type. But, after all, it is true that between the average Englishman and the average Indian the bigger Nawab to this day both in *ease* and in *pose* is the Indian rather than the Englishman, because the Englishman's Nawabism if anything is at best assumed in India. It is not in him. It is not natural to him. Whereas the Nawabism of the Indian is in his veins, and his freedom is only of the lips. When the English official goes to the club in the evening he has to shake off his Nawabism and mix with

every one there on a footing of equality. The English merchants, missionaries, planters or bankers break the officialdom, and the Englishman has been so brought up that he looks upon his office as a mere necessity, but his real life is out of it. He is more visible in his genuine colours when he is out of office, in the club, in the house, in the hunting ground, or in sports. He is then at his best. But with the Indian it is entirely different. It is just the other way. Power and authority are the air he breathes, and office is the life he lives. To club and clubbability of the genuine sort, he is a stranger. Consciousness of power and consciousness of office are his food and drink. He carries it wherever he goes.

In the Native States, this tendency is even more pronounced than here to this day. His Excellency the Governor or the Viceroy may be all affability, and Council Members and Civilians as a rule may be all courtesy and kindness to us; but the Indian gods strike one at times as much more imperious and imperial in their attitude. One despairs whether English education has after all effected any change in this matter. Perhaps with the Indians it has made things worse. We hear so much about want of touch between the Civilians and the People for want of knowledge on their part of the vernaculars. But the educated Indian has become a caste by himself. He looks down upon the rest of his countrymen: he would not mix with them freely because it is *infra dig*. The Indian officers become again a caste by themselves. They look down upon the rest. The educated non-officials who are mostly Vakils, have their revenge on their own Indian officers whom they cut severely at their club, and the result

is the feeling of official *versus* non-official, has now grown into a creed.

The Englishman is trained to subordinate himself to higher interests. He is trained to public life infinitely more than we are. He is trained to value and appreciate honest opinions and convictions even when he differs strongly from them. He is trained to the great virtue of a frank recognition of merit wherever found. But in all these respects and many more, we have to learn a great deal from England. The convictions of a popular public man in England are sacred to him and to his following and to his country. He is constantly arraigned at the bar of public opinion for any change of front, and he is on his trial. But here public opinion has yet to be formed on a great many matters of public concern. Most of our public men are made in a very rough and ready manner, and their opinions too are equally rough and ready. But thanks to the English education we can to-day show among us brilliant examples of public men though they are numerically small.

Again the liberty of the press and freedom of speech are very dear to Englishmen. The English know also how to take the press opinions at their worth. The English press, the English public opinion, the English national life and the British Parliament have all grown together whereas here the press is yet in its infancy and the trials incidental to it. The people have been accustomed only to personal politics and they cannot often rise above the level of personalities to the perception of principles, and therefore what interests the average Indian reader as well as the Indian press is very often personal criticism; but intervals of reason come when no personal

interests are at stake. But the liberty of the press or the freedom of speech is never at stake with Englishmen *as a rule*. The Mysore Press Law apart from its merits one way or the other and barely as a matter of principle, involving legislation against the press, has passed more easily in the Mysore State than it would have done under the British Government. Hyderabad would be even more summary with the press or with dissentients or angry criticisms against itself.

"The King can do no wrong"; "He is above all criticism": This is out and out an oriental sentiment and it is enforced in the Native States by the highest Indian officers therein. Whereas the theory that even "The cat can look at the King" is purely British. The Native States have sometimes visited the press with scant courtesy. The treatment provokes no sensation in the States concerned; but all the opposition to it comes from our side. Mr. Pal carefully omitted the Native States from his programme. He played his game freely over the British province. From the Mysore Advisory Committee the pressmen were excluded. The Indian press is angry. But the Mysore Government is not going to truckle to the press. It has got its own reasons for excluding the pressmen from the meetings and it is not going to hold itself responsible to the press. I do not know what Radicals would call this in England, and how many questions would be put in Parliament about such doings if the British Government had done such a thing. But being Native States, which possess perfect freedom in such matters, they are free from the fears of attack in Parliament at the hands of pseudo-philanthropists whose quixotic mission is in striking contrast with what goes on in the

Native States. Let me tell you, my dear Sir, Indian blood is infinitely more autocratic than the English. The average English politician knows the responsibility of forming opinions and holding them. He knows the difficulty of giving them up. His political opinions are a part of his public life and public character. But most of our politicians (barring just a few brilliant exceptions) in a country of millions are just beginning their political alphabet. The newspapers do the thinking for the politicians, and thinking is so troublesome that the average Indian politician is willing to adopt the thought of others as his for the time being. The Indian press generally has come to think that its function is to play the role of opposition to the Government as completely as possible, and it is found to pay. The politicians who differ from the press get short shrift. Indian politics has been all along politics of the purely personal type. It is in the blood of the people. In Native States, politics is simply making and unmaking the men in power, even to this day. During the pre-British days it was making and unmaking of the men in power or the Government of the day. It was done not by the press but by the old, old oriental weapon of party spirit and intrigue. The man in power, be he a Peshwa or Dewan, had at once his rival. Each had his own following, and the function of each party was to do its best against the man in power and pull him to pieces. You find this spirit, the same even now more or less in the Native States. English education has not minimised it very much. It has only made the weapon of intrigue sharper, but it is covered now with velvet. That is education! Has English education stopped in Native States, party politics and the politics of making and

unmaking Dewans? It has not. The way party feeling works in India is woeful, wonderful and worth studying by every honest Britisher at home and in India, because in studying it he has studied the real life of India, and in holding the balance against its evil influences he has mastered the secret as well as the difficulty of the British rule in India. If he fails to grasp it, the result is disaster. When one Dewan goes out and another comes in, the reversal of policy consists mainly in his own men coming up and in his predecessor's men going down. To this usual and invariable party spirit is added current feelings due to conflicting interests making the situation only more complicated. A man may be far above the average in character and intellect, but he may get crushed on account of this party spirit. This is un-English but quite normal in Native States. In Travancore, the feeling is brahmans *versus* non-brahmans and a thousand such details of clique and cliquism baffling the strength and skill of the Britisher, constitute the normal Indian life. If the Dewan sent to rule the Native States happens to be too radical, he would upset the coach of Government, but if he is too timid to initiate urgent reforms on sound and rational lines of western thought, he would leave the Augean stables of custom and prejudice, corruption and cliquism untouched. The golden mean of taking a step or two in advance without aspiring for giant strides is the only thing given to the practical and wise statesman who reserves his Utopia to himself and takes care not to become another Don Quixote. This party spirit and personal politics being so much in the Indian blood, no wonder the Indian press is deeply affected by it. For who are the Editors? They are

not generally men with the large creed necessary for holding the balance evenly between the Indian classes, but they are themselves men of class-prejudices and sect sympathies and Provincial patriotism, and carry their own personal politics into their papers more or less. They are however agreed about one thing, *and that is, opposing the Government*. This accounts for the absence of papers representing various political parties in India. They are all engaged in the work of opposing Government. As remarked by a keen observer, the so-called public opinion may turn out on examination often enough "*the very private opinion of a very private man*." But all the same, the Indian editor has become a power. He is well-read, and he is conscious that the British sentiment of liberty gives him a place in the Fourth Estate of the Realm. He can sooner do so under the British Government than the Native States, and he need only pitch into the Government in and out of season to show himself off. It is thus he makes himself felt.

The Editors of the Indian press, and even their reporters and correspondents, are becoming little press-autocrats. This is interesting study. They are talking democracy for the purpose of making themselves autocrats. They have become autocrats more or less. That is the Indian tenancy. You start an organization to put down caste. It soon becomes another caste. The press wants to check uncontrolled power and abuse of authority. But it soon becomes a tyranny, which may be termed the tyranny of the press. At the head of the opposition to the Government sits the Editorial God whose aim is to vie with the other Gods. Twenty years ago the Indian press worked with the public more on principles

and less on personal considerations, but now the rule of the Indian editor has become very personal indeed! While he is protesting against the incense offered at the altar of officialdom he wants a lot himself, and he gets it in abundance. He wants to be seen by the biggest men. Hon'ble Members of Council, Dewans of Native States and the highest officials who look upon an angry comment on them as a calamity; all those want now the Editor's good-will both to put them up and not to pull them down. Power has got now not only separated from the Government, but it has been shifted to the Indian press. One paper openly said that it had pulled down one Dewan and put up another.

Seeing how opposition to Government pays the English knowing Editor, and how it has made him a power in the land, every vernacular editor has taken the cue from him and has opened the campaign of opposition against Government. The process is simplicity itself. Accept nothing done by the Government as done either with a good intention or as likely to do good, oppose the Government in an Irish spirit and write always in the spirit of an "Agin Government man." This policy in England would get checked by another class of papers but in India the great thing to remember is, the same thing will not occur because the Indian press has already succeeded in creating a taste for opposition-literature against the Government, regardless of the merits of the opposition, and so, the taste of the reading public wants the sort of stuff on which it has been fed. Till a healthy current of journalism is widely created, the people who differ from the Indian press will have no organ of public opinion suited to their sound and moderate views on

politics, and till then, the Opposition press will go on increasing in power for baulking the Government at every step. Till then the real public opinion of the educated Indian public will be submerged and silent, for want of a voice. If they go to the Anglo-Indian press they are put down as truckling to them. If they write to the Indian press their opinions differing from those of the editor they either get badly clipped before being published, or they are thrown into the waste paper basket. Contradictions to editorial attacks and opinions were at one time allowed to appear as a matter of bare courtesy to dissentients, but now the motto has come to be "the editor can do no wrong." "There is no contradicting him." We have thus come to suffer from editorial autocracy more than the so-called Bureaucracy. Pray remember the Editorial Autocracy of the red-hot school of politics between whom and the British Government there is really no love lost. The Radicals are playing into the hands of this section of the press unconsciously.

A.—Have you been connected with any press yourself?

R.—Yes. I was for years the unpaid correspondent of one paper at least. That was when the paper had something like principle. There was then no Anti-British feeling.

A.—The commercial spirit is the cause. It is invading everywhere. Even in England the press is not what it should be. But the public are not, I think, as easily taken in by the press opinions as perhaps here. The press is a great power when rightly used, but if used to push wrong ideas or class interests or Anti-British feeling above all it is an awful situation to be sure.

R.—That is where it is. Whatever appears in print here, has a charm about it. Nobody knows how much of it has not affected the average man. It has affected him in nine out of ten cases more than it should have been. That is where the trouble comes. Indian readers are too credulous. They are too timid towards the press. This tendency has affected the British public at home. Nobody knows how much of the dirt thrown by the malevolent critics of the Anti-British school has stuck. I wish the British public would remember what Lord Morley said in 1908. He said:—

"If my existence either officially or corporally were prolonged twenty times longer than either of them is likely to be, a Parliamentary system in India is not at all the goal to which I would for one moment aspire."

Nevertheless, let me hasten to make the admission that the Indian press has got on its staff men here and there who would do honour to any country in the world for public character of the highest type.

CHAPTER III.

BRITISH AND NATIVE INDIA

AND

The Press and Caste Spirit.

A.—But don't you think that the British spirit in British India is a powerful antidote to party spirit and intrigue? And that in British India the spirit of intrigue has not as much play as in the Native States? How do you compare British India with Native India.

R.—Yes. The difference between British India and Native India is remarkable in several respects. That again is an interesting study. The one point wherein British India markedly differs from Native India is the spirit of personal liberty and the spirit of public criticism. In British India every one walks with his head aloft, that is, what you have taught us to do, but in Native India, the attitude is bending down one's head. In British India we are conscious of serving something impersonal, but in Native India what one has to serve is persons more and principles less. A scion of the Royal family of Travancore and a brilliant Master of Arts preferred British service to his own Travancore service. A high English Official was struck with the incongruity and asked His Highness the Maharajah, in the presence of the young man, why he was allowed to seek British service. His

Highness said " He does not care for us." The young man at once retorted, " No, Your Highness, here one has to serve persons; there, one has to serve principles. I prefer the latter to the former." That is British spirit. Another Prince of Travancore, who also, alas ! is no more, used to say that when he was in his own State he felt himself a prisoner, but when he treaded the British soil, he felt himself a freeman. In his own State there was not a moment when he was free from the gaze of observers and the attention of flatterers. So he made it a point regularly to come to the British side for breathing the air of freedom. Would Englishmen believe it when I say that this Prince who was a Graduate, a high Free-Mason, an accomplished singer, a good dancer, a hearty good fellow, in fact, all in all, one who would be the centre of English society, found himself tyrannised by the peculiar customs of his country !

But in Native India the scope for Indian talent in administration is wider. The highest offices are manned by the Indians. The heads of departments from the Dewan downwards are Indians, and they are called upon to display their highest talent and energy, and so far, it must be said to have proved a success; but it should not be forgotten that they owe it essentially to the British spirit animating the administration as their model. They closely copy the British system through chosen and competent Indians who have imbibed the British principles and who try to vie with all that is best in the British system. The ideal is to adopt all that is good in the British system to the conditions of Native States through the Indian machinery of administration. There is said to be more freedom of initiative in Native India than in British India

which is due to the comparative simplicity of the machinery and to the smallness of the area under administration. British India is in its very nature and extent vastly more complex and complicated, and the difference in area and population is not to be lost sight of in instituting a comparison between the two ; Division for Division and Taluq for Taluq, the work is more here. In Native India, the European element in administration is markedly less than in British India, and this imparts in the administration its peculiar colour and character. The European element is naturally the dominant feature in British India, while in Native India the Indian element has the upper hand. Each has its own peculiar merits and drawbacks, and we, on the British side, have got for our model the superior energy, system and vigour of the British to copy much more largely than there. But it strikes one that while British India may adopt and assimilate from time to time whatever has suited the Native States, the Indian genius and the Indian sentiment, the Native States should never lose sight of the fact that more and more complete dissociation from even the minimum of the British element in administration will result in the weakening of that moral fibre and strength which with the British is instinct. The proper combination in British India as well as Native India which may be described as the common basis of both, is the British *plus* the Indian, working side by side in all that concerns the highest well-being of both. I, for one, believe that any tendency to divorce unduly and beyond certain limits the British and Indian elements either here or there is likely to do in the long run more harm than good and to impair the general tone and efficiency of administration. Apart from the position

between the British and Indians as rulers and ruled, and bearing in mind their essential characteristics, they appeal to me more as complements indispensable to each other and not as combatants who should develop anything like a feeling of incompatibility between them. There is not only room, but there is clear necessity for the best specimens of the British animating the administration till Indians come up to their level. The best way of curing an unhealthy feeling of rivalry and jealousy between the two communities is to look to increasing the stock of the best in both and not pushing up the mediocres. For example, the decadence of the race of English Barristers in Madras is due doubtless to the ascendency of the Vakils of which they may feel proud, but I, for one, wish we had amidst us in the Bar, the great examples we used to have at one time of English Barristers for keeping up the high level and the great traditions of the English Bar. My ideal is a combination of brilliant English Barristers working side by side with the Indian Vakils. In driving out the English Barristers we have gained commercially, but we have lost morally and intellectually. Let us not forget the giants that once adorned the Bar from among the English Barristers. A Sullivan who made Sir Bashyam Aiyangar, a John Bruce Norton who pleaded warmly the cause of Indians, a Mayne whose Hindu Law is still our text book, are names for forensic eminence and legal acumen by the side of whom the best Vakils and Indian Barristers may well take a subordinate place. Even the lesser lights that adorned the Madras Bar latterly left a great mark for character and individuality which were a source of inspiration to their surroundings. What is

true of the Madras Bar is true all round. Likewise one hears in Native States the names of British Officers of old which are a household word to-day.

As for the press, we have been compelled to create the press law. The Mysore Press Law is a more stringent measure. It is impossible for the Englishman to live without his paper. Evening tea, newspaper and cigar are the tripod of his social life. The Englishman would as easily commit suicide as kill the liberty of the press. But he finds the infant Indian press has come to mistake its function. Therefore what he has been compelled to do much against his grain, is to control by legislation its thoughtless and undisciplined excesses in order that the ignorant Indian public may not go off their heads as they have already done. But in Native States the exit of the Goddess of Liberty of speech and thought evokes no tear. Here are two extremes containing the problem. Is the press to be controlled or killed? In Mysore, the feeling is that they are all to-day very much the poorer for want of a free paper, and so long as the press law continues unchanged, no paper worth the name can live. The author of press legislation in Mysore, true to his liberal instincts, feels that the time is come for amending the press law and letting the newspapers live. But the fear has perhaps come to invade the minds of our Maharajahs, and not unnaturally, whether the institution of a free press might not prove dangerous in the long run to their own power and prestige. If the press exercises its functions in India in a manner tending to upset the people's minds and produce a feeling of unrest and disaffection to the Government, it becomes a matter of the gravest concern as to how to separate the

healthy freedom of the press and let it live, taking care to curb its erratic tendencies. The problem apparently strikes the Indian ruling instinct as best solved by letting the press live only on stringent conditions.

An English Civilian District Magistrate, who was better known as an archeologist than administrator, once told me "I am glad I am not a Brahman: Life is spent in intrigue from morning to evening." It will take a long time before this tendency disappears.

A.—How can you be so hard against Brahminism?

R.—I oppose false Brahmanism as against true Brahmanism. Go and ask anywhere about the general feeling of antagonism and conflict of interests between Brahmans and non-brahmans, between Hindus and Mahomedans, or between Brahmans and Nairs, or again between Hindus and Christians, you will find that the fight is between class against class for office and power. Among Brahmans themselves, the fight is between the various sects. Have people in England any idea of this? Do they know anything about the bitter feeling of resentment of non-brahmans as a class against Brahmans? Do they realize the intensity of sectarian feeling among the Brahmans themselves? You will hear the murmur all over India of the war between classes wherever you go. The weaker sect or class for the time being in point of power and influence goes to the wall. The tendency of the stronger class or sect is consciously and even unconsciously to monopolise office and power. We want the British to hold the balance evenly between us, though even they at times succumb to the combination and power of a class. What can they do? They are but human. If one class comes to hold power and office very largely,

it can effectually keep down the other classes in a thousand ways, and even the most lynx-eyed of British officers may be unable to cope with the situation, because wherever they turn round if they find the class influence of any *one* class prevail by their numbers, this class being most in touch with the Government can easily carry the day with the Government and become virtually the ruling power. The Government must consult those nearest them, and if one class happens to be nearer than the rest, that class has the ear of the Government and easily wins in preference to the rest. The other classes go to the wall. This is India. Am I not right? Am I drawing one bit upon my imagination? No, Sir, no. The strongest working feeling in India is "Our class," *versus* "Your class." *The nation is nowhere. The class is everywhere.* The wail of the weak is "my class is gone to the bottom. That class is in the zenith of its power. If only I had belonged to that class, I should have been better off:" A balancing of power between the classes as far as possible and consistently with efficiency is absolutely necessary. Otherwise it becomes a wrong to the weaker and may prove a danger to the administration. It becomes positive injustice to the men of the classes out of power and the British must come to the rescue. But the combination proves at times, as I said already, too strong even for the British which shows that the British Government must never yield to clamour or prejudice of class against class, however cleverly the game might be played. The glory of the British administration lies in this that the weaker always seeks its protection and what is more, it gets it. *The chorus of the weaker classes is "Where would all of us be but for the British? The answer is "Nowhere."*

Even to this day, it is only barely true that the true and generous friend of merit, be it in the lowest of the low or the highest of the high, is the British. It is to them the eye of the country looks with confidence. It is again true that every Indian of position or eminence owes it to the firm grip and frank appreciation of the British. Now before the people can share power with the Government, they must show that they can hold the balance evenly between the various classes.

Till now, the advance we have made in the right direction in these respects, though considerable, is yet but a drop not *in the bucket* as Mr. Ramsay Macdonald would say, but a drop *in the ocean.* Till now we have been in the region of mere theories and ideas about the higher life. Mere theories and ideas do not help us much. And in India it is well to remember that what has to be changed is not merely a detail here and there, but it is the customary centres of social life that have to be changed. It is the customary pivots of social existence that have to be shifted. Social and religious ideas of ages and centuries need changing, but till then the higher life is in the hope, in the air, but it is not yet in the life. You should not therefore be surprised if I tell you that the struggle till then will be between the life we are living and the life we are aiming at. Till then we shall be talking the higher life, but we shall be living the lower. We shall be wishing for the broader life, but we shall be constantly pulled down by our surroundings and be content to live in them for the sake of peace. There is not an Englishman in India who does not know this. There is not an Indian who does not feel it. The spirit of schism which we still possess in abundance cannot be

wiped out in a day by mere political institutions sprung upon us. *As Mr. Justice Ranade, one of the greatest of leaders of Indian Reform thought used to say it is not the privileges which others give us that will save India, it is the development of our own life and living in the right direction that is going to be the Saviour.* Indian public life will be till then, one-sided and defective. The life within we Indians, the life of our very homes; in short, our domestic and social life has to be the starting point of the great reformation that is to save India. Till that is done, we are getting to tell you the truth, disgusted with ourselves, despairing about our future and making confessions to each other. The confession is now running round every one that, after all, we are not facing our real problem in a proper spirit. The confession is also going round that Lord Morley's Reform Scheme has only put us on a severe trial, and that if we do not begin the wider life now at least, there is no hope.

CHAPTER IV.

THE HIGHER LIFE OF INDIA

AND

THE MISSION OF ENGLAND.

A.—What do you mean when you say the wider life has not yet come to India?

R.—I mean that, while Indian intellect has been roused under the magic wand of English education, the broken fragments of real Indian life, real Indian wisdom, real Indian art and, above all, *real Indian* character, have yet to be picked up and woven fresh into the life of the nation. The Indian political vicissitudes of ages have, among other things, broken the Indian character as well. It is the character building that is the immediate problem before Indians.

A.—Has not that begun?

R.—Hardly yet, I am afraid, in anything like an earnest spirit even by the bulk of those who see clearly the need for it. It has not taken hold of the general mind, though there is just at present a wide yearning after it.

A.—But don't you think that a bit of the life you want has come to Bengal and also to Bombay though perhaps Madras is still lagging, because of the numerous sects and sub-sects into which Madras is divided. I am afraid

you are taking Madras as a standard while it is perhaps the least advanced in the essentials of the great reformation you seek.

R.—There is considerable truth in what you say. Bengal stands first in intellect. Bombay is perhaps good second, and Madras is modest third. But all of us share the national defect of being more sentimental and less practical, and more critical than constructive. Besides, all of us have taken hold of the wrong end of the stick instead of the right one, and that is the cause of all our trouble. Till we give up the wrong end and take hold of the right end, I am afraid the future of India will be enveloped in darkness though flashes of light may appear and disappear.

A.—What do you consider the right end and what do you call the wrong end?

R.—The right end is social and religious reformation on lines of ancient Indian wisdom under the British overlordship, on the basis of true Imperialism, while the wrong end is mere political advance on democratic lines without social reformation and with anti-British feelings leading to political anarchism. To take the example of Japan which is so near us, if only Japan, like India, had stuck to her old and narrow ways of life and living and had developed anti-British feelings, she would by this time have had to capitulate before the west. Japan took the right end of the stick and built herself up on the basis of internal reform and complete devotion to all that is best in the western civilization. If India should adopt to-morrow the same track, the first thing to do is to give up political anarchism and anti-British feelings and begin social and religious reformation

on the basis of fellowship between England and India. Were proof wanted of the need for social and religious reformation, you have it in the following figures given by Mon. Chailley :—

"As regards child marriage, the statistics are stupefying. In India the 1901 census showed 121,500 married boys and 243,500 married girls whose age was under 5; between the ages of 5 and 10 the figures are 760,000 and 2,030,000 respectively; between 10 and 15, 2,540,000 and 6,585,000. Further there were no less than 1,277,000 widowed persons under 20, of whom 914,000 were females. Of these, 6,000 widowers and 96,000 widows were less than 5 years of age; 37,000 widowers and 96,000 widows between 5 and 10; and 113,000 widowers and 296,000 widows between 10 and 15. These figures testify to the result of infant marriages, one of the parties to which has died coupled with the almost general forbiddal of the re-marriage of widows in the higher castes. A little girl married, or to speak more accurately betrothed, at 4 or 5 may become a widow at 6 and must remain so all her life."

No wonder the confession is going round the mouth of every Indian, including even the anarchist, that India cannot do without England for a day—and for a long time to come. The confession is also going round that we are yet nowhere compared with England as a nation—in arts and industries, in commerce and character, in the development of economic resources, and in the spirit of enterprise, and that we must learn patiently all that the Western World has yet to teach us.

To quote the French author, M. G. Ainslie Height, once more, this is what he says about Social Reform

commenting on a set of speeches and writings I had sent him on the subject. He says :—

"It is most gratifying to me to know that a Native of India is working so strenuously on lines very similar to my own. Indians have my warmest sympathy, especially in the matter of child marriages. Your cause is certain to triumph in the end, though it may not be in our lifetime. When the more enlightened heads amongst a people begin to realise as you do and others of your countrymen, what position women may and ought to hold, and how great may be her power, the end cannot be doubtful. Infant marriages are not enjoined by the Shastras as you point out, nor are re-marriages of widows prohibited. In that fact lies your strength against all opposition on religious grounds, rather than in a doctrine of freedom which is at the best a mystery." That M. G. A. Height is not one of those Europeans who merely find fault with our customs and look down on us as an inferior race of men, but that he has a profound admiration for the ancient philosophy of India and love for the Indians would appear from the following part of his letter. He says, "I do not hesitate to put the Vedanta Philosophy on a level with, or even above, the highest thought of Europe not excepting Plato and Kant as regards Metaphysic, though these have the advantage of literary style and more luminous working out. Particularly I have been struck by the close affinity between the thought of the Upanishads and our Christianity. This may not seem clear to you, if you judge of Christianity either by what you see of it in its modern form or by what you have read of the history of councils, etc. But it came home to me when I was in Rome last

winter and saw something of the early Christian church, that is during the first three centuries of its existence, when its thought began to find utterances before it became corrupted by politics. I see you quote Bacon, Mell, Spencer, etc. Nothing can be farther from me than to wish to belittle these great men or the noble work to which they have devoted their lives. It was much needed and was well done. Still there are some of us who begin to think that perhaps they may have carried us too far with their rationalist ideas of Liberty, Equality etc..................I do not think that theories and formulas will help us much. The practical difficulty that in snatching at liberty, you only escape from one bondage to another remains. But it will come of itself in so far as a people is fitted to receive it. For the present our first duty is to guard the integrity of our sacred writings, a duty which has been sadly neglected both in Europe and in India, where they have been so tampered with by priests and politicians that it is difficult to distinguish the divine from the human....................Have you ever read Schopenhauer? He is well worthy of study by brahmans, and is tolerably translated into English. He has certainly without comparison the greatest philosophical mind of the last century, but is unpopular especially at the Universities partly because of his very aggressive style, partly because his thought is too high for most men. He takes his starting point from the same ideas as the Upanishads, which were, I am told, always open in his room, at a time when few people in Europe even knew their name. His thought is entirely Indian, but developed in harmony with the logic and science of our time......................I wish you good-bye

and God speed in the work which you are doing for your fellow countrymen."

A.—Supposing Indian social and religious reformation on the lines you indicate either cannot come at all or does not come for an indefinitely long time, do you mean to say that no popular form of government should till then come to India? What is the form of government you would propose for India as best suited to it, till India becomes fit for some form of self-government, say, like the self-governing colonies?

R.—It is impossible to lay down the limits of time up to which a particular form of government should continue and when another form should come in. It is a question of constitutional growth. England has pushed her own liberal form of government in British India not merely in advance of the conditions of the people, but also in opposition to the genius of the country. However, it is worth trying a great experiment as to how the Indian genius is going to deal with it. Whether it is going to assimilate it and make it a part of herself will depend, as I have been telling you, very largely indeed on the upbuilding of her social efficiency. If she does not care to effect it, India will have nothing to complain against England. But if British India does assimilate a popular form of government by developing the requisite social efficiency, the Native States may have to follow suit and adopt, in course of time, something like the form of government in British India. But if British India means to preserve the main lines of her ancient form of government without caring for a Parliamentary form, the best proof she could afford of this tendency on her part, would be to continue as she has been doing all along, to turn a deaf

ear to the call of social and religious reformation and stick to her political outcry merely as a temporary makeshift. India at present does not know her own mind. But there are not indications wanting, as I have been urging all along, that her own genius and traditions are rather for a limited monarchy than for a self-governing colony. A limited monarchy is quite in keeping with the spirit and genius of India. It is to that all changes and struggles, social, political and religious, are in all probability, veering round to-day in India. If so, is it not best to develop that form for which India is most fitted and which she most desires instead of embarking her on the unknown deep of a form of government which, even if it succeeds to a certain extent under British guidance and control, is not likely to strike anything like deep roots in the soil. If so, would not the experiment be a sheer waste of energy? Would it not be even perilous as could be seen from the course of events? It appears to me that trying the experiment of domocracy in India of continental vastness and countless millions is like breaking the embankments of a mighty reservoir and letting the floods loose. The greatest calamity that may befall India is mob-rule in any form or shape. There are clear indications on the horizon already, that the worst tendencies of mob-rule are taking forms and shapes, and you may at once see what course they will run if unchecked. We know from the history of the west something of the terrors of mob-rule and the devastations it will cause. Before it gets out of hand it will be wise on the part of England to quickly adapt herself to the Indian genius and adopt at once those principles which will define and work the limited form of

monarchy under which British rule in India would become the best form of Indian government, instead of becoming as it has already begun to be, a doubtful democratic experiment at tremendous cost. Under the caste-civilization of India, the millions of India have been accustomed to maintain a sense of mutual dependence, stability, law-abidingness and order which dispensed with the police as well as militia. Now all that is changing. The end of all government should be to secure peace and order, not at a maximum but at a minimum cost, not at the maximum of physical and minimum of moral force, but rather at the maximum of moral and minimum of physical force. It is this system India has been accustomed to. And caste, despite all its defects as seen to-day, has succeeded in securing obedience to law and authority on the basis of the moral force more than on that of the physical force. The great problem is how to minimise or wipe out the objectionable and unprogressive features of caste without doing away with the great conservatism for good underlying it. If England would really adopt this course, it should be no doubt on Indian lines of all that is best in the ancient Indian polity and not as she is doing now, purely on western lines. Supposing England were to rule India on the ancient Indian model, there would be at once a great and cheerful response from the people, and it would at once disarm even the most fierce and reckless opponents of the British Government, who have now taken to the game of anarchism which was unknown to India for ages and centuries, even of the worst misrule.

A.—The question is how to effect this Reform you talk about.

R.—It is simple once you imbibe the spirit of the Indian genius of government. The central principle is to look upon the people just as an Indian monarch with his Indian council would look upon India and Indian interests. It would put an end to conflict of Indian interests with other interests, be they commercial or political, and the Indian interests will come to weigh with the Government not merely as the first and foremost but as the only one which the Government of India would be called upon to defend. That is the true Indian spirit of Indian polity. There would then be the Indian genius of government working through British overlordship. There would at once be not only a coalition of feeling between the Government and the people, but a coalition of interests as well, and England, which has already done so much to uplift India, would become in the eye of the people in no way different from her own native government. What England is now doing towards India, is the highest example of justice and fair play of one nation ruling over another. But the system I have before me is one under which there is a coalition of feeling between India and England as a composite whole. Indians and Englishmen would at once have to throw off their differences and opposing currents of thought and feeling, racial, national or religious, and would come to feel that the ideal to be evolved is not merely a westernised form of eastern government or a dead unprogressive form of the eastern monarchy, but a combination of the energy of the west with the wisdom of the east. This is given only to the British genius to evolve, and that appears to my mind the great solution in which the best thoughts of England will permeate the

best thoughts of India and produce a result which would be the crown and glory of the British rule.

A.—Can you describe to me that political millennium? It seems to me more imaginary than real. Can you perceive it yourself?

R.—Being a state of things which has yet to be realised in the world, it naturally strikes you as nothing more than a dream. But you must know that the British Government in India as it is, is itself one of those marvels which if prophets had foretold, none would have believed. Therefore our inability to perceive a state of things, infinitely better than the present is no valid argument against it. We can all but dimly realise it in our imagination, provided we bear in mind the essential points of the genius of England and the genius of India, and know how to weave the one into the other.

A.—I am afraid it is more easily said than done. How would you satisfy the thousand points of conflict between the East and West and between the interests of England and India? There is no hiding the fact that when one country rules over another there are certain difficulties and inconveniences incidental to it, which are absent from a free and self-governing country. You cannot by any means remove these incidents of a foreign Government. Secondly, it must not be forgotten that the Government of every country in the world, be it foreign or native, must depend upon the strength of arms in the ultimate analysis. Your own Sanskrit saying, you have forgotten. It says " Balo Raja Prithivi."

The world belongs to the strongest. In pre-British days, India was a prey to rival claimants for supremacy, and what decided the victory, was not who was the most just

or the most intelligent and capable of the claimants but merely who proved the strongest in the field. You know in ancient days in India when the system of Aswameda Yaga was prevalent, war was waged for no reason at all, except to prove who was the strongest. A horse was let loose with a motto on a plate tied to its forehead, and whoever ventured to catch the horse and keep it had either to fight and win, or surrender and lose. So did Arjuna fight his battles. That is the true spirit of Kashatriya. But now the spirit of the world has so far changed, that though arms and armaments are being looked after and increased, the tendency to war and bloodshed is distinctly on the wane. The world spirit is itself stepping from one ideal into another. The end of war is after all peace. But the end of peace should not be again war. It must be something else.

R.—It is quite a surprise to me to hear you propound the Indian ideas. It is wonderful how when we Indians are trying to grasp the Western ideals, Westerns like you are trying to grasp the Indian. And the salvation of India, and I may say of the world itself, rests in unifying these two classes; *of Indians who represent the best of western thought and culture, and of Englishmen who represent the best of Indian thought and culture, and making them the instruments for working the future of the British Empire. These are to be the builders of the future. The rest may be left out of consideration.*

A.—That again is a dream. I was going to tell you that though the world spirit is now more for peace than war, the world has not yet become so unselfish as you and I may desire. Where national interests clash, there the weaker goes to the wall. England is in India by right

of conquest just like any other conquering dynasty or race before the British rule. They continued to hold the reins of government as long as they could; that is exactly the way you should expect England also to go on. England will hold India as long as it could. This is, however, not inconsistent with the British principle so beautifully expressed in the Queen's Proclamation about England's mission in India. It is necessary to hold the country if you would do your mission by the people entrusted to your care.

B.—Pray don't forget the part Indians and Indian troops played in the Mutiny. *It is more glorious to England to say that it holds India not merely by the sword but by the devotion of the people as well to England. That is the truth.* I quite agree with you that England must hold India for fulfilling her mission. It is well that the unfriends of British Government both here and in England just realise how well and nobly on the whole England has done by India from the day of the great Proclamation up to date. Let me make a rapid review. You know how after the mutiny, the great question was as to what the motive power of British rule in India should be. Was it to be merely to rule India as long as possible, keeping the people under the thumb, or was it to be to raise India to the level of a self-governing country in due course? There were two schools of men, as usual, on such occasions. The memory of the mutiny had made things sufficiently bitter for the narrow school who believed that the policy should be either one of retrogression or standstill, but the other school representing the broader view and the wider outlook voted against the narrow school, and then did British genius

speak out the policy to be pursued. The narrow school cried out, "India for England," "India for the East India Company," but those who looked farther ahead said, "India for India."

Sir William Jones said: "the principal object of every Government is the happiness of the governed."

Sir Thomas Munro was equally emphatic in his opinion.

Lord Metcalfe said: "if the spread of knowledge may eventually be fatal to our rule in India, I close on that point and maintain that whatever may be the consequence it is our duty to communicate the benefits of knowledge. If India could only be preserved as a part of the British Empire by keeping its inhabitants in a state of ignorance, our domination would be a curse to the country and ought to cease. But I see more ground for just apprehension in ignorance itself. I look to the increase of knowledge, with a hope that it may strengthen our empire; that it may remove prejudices; soften asperities, and substitute a national conviction of the benefits of our Government that may unite the people and their rulers in sympathy, and that the differences which separate them may be gradually lessened and ultimately annihilated. Whatever, however, be the will of Almighty Providence, respecting the future Government of India, it is clearly our duty, as long as the charge be confided to our hands, to execute the trust to the best of our ability for the good of the people. The promotion of knowledge is manifestly an essential part of that duty." Sir Charles Trevelyan said: "I conceive that in determining upon a line of policy, we must look to the probable eventualities. We must have presented to our

minds what will be the result of each line of policy. Now, my belief is that the ultimate result of the policy of improving and educating India will be to postpone the separation for a long indefinite period and that when it does come it will take place under circumstances very happy for both parties."

Mr. Halliday, the Governor of Bengal, said: "I go the full length of saying that I believe our mission in India is to qualify them for governing themselves: I say also that the measures of the Government for a number of years past have been advisedly directed to so qualifying them without the slightest reference to any remote consequences upon our administration."

The Duke of Argyll speaking in the House of Lords in February, 1857, said: "Our Empire will never cease until one of two events happened,—either until we had declined from the valour and virtue of those who founded that Empire or else—*and might God speed the time*—we should have raised the people of India more nearly to a level with ourselves." This was received with cheers in the House.

The Duke of Argyll has put the thing in a nutshell. The British Empire must last till one of two things happens. Till there is a decline in the valour and virtue of the British or till India has risen to a level with the rulers as a capable self-governing nation. That the great ideal set before themselves in the Government of India 50 years ago has been steadily carried out and that on the whole the British valour and virtue has been holding sway through thick and thin, is undeniable. That the Indians as a Nation are yet far from fitness for self-government is equally undeniable. That

the mission of England in India has been so far one of steady fulfilment notwithstanding the defects or deficiencies inevitable in a huge Government is patent. Were the mission of England not so, and were the ideal of Government in India essentially one of narrow selfishness instead of being one of large-hearted progressiveness, we should not to-day witness the enlargement of the legislative councils, Indian members of Parliament, Indian members of the Executive Councils, Indian members in the Secretary of State's Council, Indian Justices of the High Court, eminent Indian Educationists, Indian Dewans of Native States; in short, a growing India in all directions. We should not witness to-day an Indian, Mr. Bose, in the field of western science. Thus England's mission was not only declared long ago, but it has been carried out so as to result on the whole in efficient administration, spread of education, advance of educated Indians, and advance of a popular form of government on western lines.

What has to be done is to carry out the mission still further with undaunted courage and unlimited sympathy once more. That Indians after 50 years of unceasing progress are yet far from becoming a nation, is at once a guarantee and necessity for British rule in India for a long time to come, during which India has to fit herself for taking her place among the nations of the world. This can be done by the Indians only under British overlordship and guidance.

Lord Morley's scheme would have been impossible even as an experiment, had the ground not been steadily prepared for it by the rulers and statesmen who preceded it, and who are to-day working it loyally and generously.

It is therefore absurd to characterise Lord Morley's reform as if it were a political cataclysm brought about by the bomb and pistol outrages of the anarchist, while it is really a constitutional reform in the light of Indian history. It is nothing more than yet another step in the fulfilment of England's mission in India expressed in unmistakeable terms by the greatest of England's statesmen 50 years ago, and which has been given effect to all through by those who have had the actual administration in their hands.

The spirit of Indian political unity which is now in the air is exotic. It is entirely western. It is due in the main to the British genius and to the system of British Government. Few people realise how tremendous has been the force of unification under British rule. The Anglo-Indian Codes, the British system of Administration of Justice, the Educational system, and the commercial spirit of the day, all these and a thousand such influences have been making for unity in India under British rule without which they would vanish this moment into the air. If there is one thing more than another which is offering resistance to this great unifying tendency of British rule, it is not the British Government, but it is the internal condition of India itself. One point in the Budget speech of Mr. Montague in the House of Commons, which must be laid to heart by every Indian is his frank allusion to the Indian social problem. While this confession of Mr. Montague is very refreshing, the pity of it is that he did not follow it to its logical consequences, but we should feel thankful to Mr. Montague for having hoisted the danger-signal in Indian politics. No Indian of any position or prominence who wants to take

the lead in politics should be allowed a place in public opinion if he does not give us his practical programme for the social upbuilding of India; and those Indians who are really hostile in spirit to social elevation while crying for the political should be relegated to a safe corner.

A.—Yes: that is the correct view of the situation on the whole. But in that case, how do you account for the fact that the words of Lord Metcalfe are being falsified? Whereas Lord Metcalfe expected as the result of English education the strengthening of the bonds of the Empire and a union of the people with the rulers, in sympathy, there is to-day more of cleavage between the two, and we are passing to-day through a period of unrest and discontent. How then do you account for the seditious troubles and seditious outrages? After all, we wanted to bring England and India closer together, and while we have been doing all we could in that direction, we find to-day the prospect of unity between England and India becoming more distant than ever and the breach appears to be becoming wider. This is surely the unexpected happening, and great hopes are getting wrecked and the saying "East is East and West is West" is becoming more true; and the two do not seem to meet, but it looks as if they would rather be where they were.

R.—It does look so just now when the clouds are passing over us. But the saying of Rudyard Kipling about East and West is but a half truth which must give way to the fuller truth that the East and West are after all to be knit together, and the present struggle itself appears to indicate that the need for the unity is only all the more, while it is expressing itself in the way of a storm before a calm. *It only means that the wholesome*

forces of the East and the wholesome forces of the West must join hands. There must be great travail before a mighty birth. It would not do for us to lose heart or to grow pessimistic. The very fact that a section of Indians have come to believe that India is already fit for self-government is perhaps in one sense the greatest compliment to British rule in India. It means that under it people have not only become conscious of themselves but even over-conscious. This is the enthusiasm of the growing childhood of India under British guidance.

CHAPTER V.

SEDITION.

A.—You asked me how I would account for the seditious troubles through which the country is passing. This is the great point for India and England to discuss calmly and dispassionately. This is the crisis we have to face.

R.—*Before* the bomb, the keenest observers and thinkers both in India and in England assigned *one* meaning to it, but *after* the bomb they have to assign *another* meaning. We have to read it in the light of facts. *Before the bomb outrages*, the cause of sedition was largely believed to be indifference on the part of the rulers to the claims of India for constitutional reform. But after the Reform Scheme of Lord Morley, sedition has not stopped. The inference is that constitutional reform and sedition have nothing to do with each other. Anarchy and sedition are things, let me say, of the West. It appears to me that it came from the West, and its nursery ground is still in the West, and its ideas and literature are bearing down from the West. Its working centres are in the West even more than in India. It is the idea of just a few who have wrongly persuaded themselves that British connection must cease if India is to progress, and as British connection cannot be severed in an open fight, the spirit of sedition has taken to the cruel pastime of bomb and bloodshed. This spirit is not of

the country. It has no place in the average Indian mind. It has not touched the Indian people. It is a political epidemic; it is really a sort of plague. While therefore it deserves to be studied and put down, it is no index of the mind of the country towards British rule. This must be grasped in England. If England should attach to it anything like political meaning or significance and mistake it as indicating the high water-mark of Indian discontent against British rule, it is a huge blunder. And if any policy is to be enunciated in the British Parliament out of tacit deference to it, it will only multiply the seditious troubles instead of putting them down. Sedition has been misread in England, and England has therefore missed till now the right method of solving it.

A.—How did you read the unrest *before* the bomb, and how do you read *after* the bomb?

R.—Ah, that is exactly the question. People in India and in England who were anxious to get at the true cause of unrest *before the bomb* ascribed the unrest mainly to three causes. (1) The progressive spirit which showed itself in the spirit of discontent, with the existing state of things and the desire for a healthy change all round, although thoughtful minds apprehended that there was a misdirection of our energies in devoting them so exclusively to the political and so little comparatively to the social and religious side. (2) To the policy of Government in inaugurating the spirit of a popular franchise without giving it a proper framework to work in, and (3) To the despair caused by this policy. So everyone thought that the moment something was done to meet the public demand for a constitutional change in Government the spirit of sedition

would disappear. But it was soon clear that the seditious school did not care for constitutional reform. It spoke its aim and purpose through its own ways and acts. Its aim was the overthrow of the British Government by pure physical force, simply because it did not like the foreign rule. It proceeds upon extremely plausible half truths and generalisations which would take in any one but the most wary in the West or East. It asserts that one's own government must be better than a foreign government, and that one's own government in spite of its defects is better than foreign government with all its excellence. Though this idea is shown to be far from the truth by the entire course of the history of British rule in India, still it has become to-day a great sentiment to conjure with, especially by a sentimental people like Indians. They are shown only the defects incidental to a foreign rule, and that too sufficiently magnified and painted black. Even some of the cleverest men holding positions of trust and confidence under British Government have been taken in by this specious assertion. Half truths are at times more dangerous than wholesale falsehoods. That a foreign government, however good, must be worse than one's own government, however weak and inefficient, is as true as saying that one's own disease is more health-giving than foreign medicine. There is a wise Indian moral which is quite illustrative of the point. It says: "Don't believe whatever is yours, to be really your friend, because the disease of your own body may prove fatal to you. Whereas the drug from the far-off mountain may cure you." There might be people who are like this foreign drug. This simile is very apt in its application to British rule in India. When the Indian

body, social and political, became too weak and diseased internally, to cohere together and grow in efficiency it was the foreign element from the far-off isle that has so far proved a great healer. But it must be remembered that there is something in the word "*foreign*" which lends itself easily to the generation of any amount of sentiment against British rule without facts and figures. I know of no foreign government in the world or history which has done on the whole more fairly and justly by the people than Great Britain has done by India. Faults there have been and faults there are, both in policy and in administration, but the question is what is the standard by which the British Government should be judged. Is the standard to be a practical and sensible one or a mere Utopian one which obtains nowhere in the world? Here is a foreign government coming to rule over millions who even to-day cannot hold themselves together for self-government, or, we may say, without going as far as self-government, that they cannot hold themselves together yet for a great many purposes of social efficiency and social organization. The social and political virtues are just dawning upon the country as a direct consequence of the spirit of the British ascendency and Western civilization. The reason is simply that national virtues take time in the building. Every Indian working any institution in India for the betterment of the country feels that these virtues are difficult of development in the people at large, and take a long time. *Surely the British are not responsible for these internal weaknesses of ours which are still with us, whatever else they might be responsible for.* There are a thousand things open to us in public life to effect, and yet it is nothing but our own

innate weakness that prevents our working on right lines. There is something in us making for lack of sustained energy, continuity of purpose, lack of initiative, courage and enterprise; and above all, the character, individual and social, which takes long periods in the evolution of history. It is nobody's fault. It is merely due to the hard and simple fact that progress is painful and is achieved only inch by inch for the individual as well as the nation.

The school of sedition, however, has sprung up out of a mass of sentiments with a colouring of facts, and figures. The sentiments are all based upon the democratic politics taught by Western history like "*no taxation without representation*," "*the people are the source of all power*," "*representative form of government is the best*," etc. In the light of these ideas, the critical spirit against the British Government and its method applied itself vigorously for 20 years and more, ignoring more or less completely the great question as to how far Indian conditions would permit the engrafting of such a form of government.

Whether India had emerged socially and religiously into a state of fitness for such a form of government was never taken into account, and whether even she meant to emerge out of it was also left out of account. The critical spirit thus developed without any proper sense of relation to facts and figures or to the fitness of the people for the form of government in question soon became divorced from anything like even an attempt at construction of the elements of a healthy social polity and became hypercritical and destructive. The conclusion was arrived at that a government which falls short of

the proposed form was an intolerable burden to the people. What the spirit of destructive criticism thus began, race bias completed. The unfortunate instances of friction between the rulers and the ruled were all pressed into service vigorously by way of showing that the British Government was not only bad but that it meant to persist in being so. This became the politics of sentiment and bias to work upon. When again, unfortunately, the *Press* on both sides began to dip the pen deep in the ink of race feeling and race bias the whole political atmosphere came to be surcharged with the feeling of race-hatred. The school which imbibed the feeling of race-hatred to the utmost naturally became the anti-British school of politics. The step afterwards to sedition and anarchism was only easy. Contact with Western countries, especially the continental countries of Europe, and their methods of wreaking vengeance for difference between the rulers and the ruled came to be taken up as the most effective weapons to play with. Thus came sedition as the result of a sentimental and destructive school of politics at the one extreme. On the other side, there is the loyal India of princes and chiefs, noblemen, and men of education, who have nothing but the greatest abhorrence for sedition and seditonists. There is the great mass of people who are going on in their old ways of quiet and peace and who are in blissful ignorance of the constitutional agitation of the educated on the one side and the outbreaks of anarchism on the other. There are the native Indian regiments which have to be borne in mind in this connection. If the anarchist organization has got for its root idea, as far as we could see, the overthrow of the

British Government, you may ask me how does it mean to compass it by these isolated, stray murders here and there of Englishmen and Indians. It is impossible to furnish a complete answer to this question unless one knows the seditious programme fully enough. But nobody knows it, and therefore one can only make a guess from what one sees of its working. It may be that it has no definite programme yet, and means only to spread its creed among the people, and these outrages are done merely to give emphasis to the point that no amount of concession in the shape of constitutional reform is going to allay or kill the spirit. Or it may be that being in its infancy as yet, it is trying to complete its organization and network of societies in all possible places and centres so that some great blow might be struck against the Government when the organization becomes powerful enough; or it may be that there is some agency either in Europe or in India, or in both, which for some unfathomable reason does not mean well by the British Government and wants to give it as much trouble as possible by supplying the seditious school with the necessary funds and materials to carry out its programme. But what is becoming clear is that secret societies and memberships are coming into existence. It is also pretty clear by comparison of the method of its work in remote and in apparently unconnected parts of the country, that it is a regular organization whose members freely use all the blessings of the British rule to the detriment of the British Government. The post office, the telegraph, the railway, and the press are taken full advantage of by the members of this creed for pushing on their work. Seditious literature

published in Europe in Indian vernaculars as well as in English are regularly received and distributed in various parts of India. Seditious books and pamphlets in English and Indian vernaculars are printed in beautiful type and poured into this country through our very post offices. When the press regulation about sedition is becoming more and more stringent, the problem of printing is solved by the printing being done outside British India in places like Pondicherry. I met once a budding seditionist who said, when asked what his programme was, that it was merely "blood and fire." This he uttered while Madras was in full swing some years ago over the seditious movement. Could you persuade this youngster by any amount of argument that his idea is wrong and likely to do no good? He has become a fanatic and fanaticism is contagious. One fanatic makes more. And so the fanatics school spreads. They all behave in the same manner as if they had got by heart the same lessons in the same school. They write exactly in the same strain, and they preach very like each other. They call their society the Barathamatha Association, and they show a predilection for the red colour in choosing even their letter papers and covers, and the red colour is supposed to have a meaning—perhaps it means blood. The members are keen enough to send their terrorising missiles to all and sundry: their style is a settled one for terrorism. The stronger the Indian loyalist or the British official in putting down sedition, the greater is the attention paid by this school to him and his doings, and the greater is the number of anonymous communications and threats showered upon him day after day. It says "The members

of the Barathamatha Association wish to inform you hereby that if you mix yourselves up with public questions as against the Barathamatha Association you will soon find the consequence you will be cut, quartered, and thrown to the winds." This is a rough specimen of the sort of letters which our post offices are made to convey, and the innocent postman made to deliver, to the addressees!! When the spirit spreads sufficiently enough in a district, you do not know how far it has spread. It has perhaps spread a great deal wider and deeper than you have any conception of. That letters pass from north to south and from east to west in the country, and that they are all kept by the workers in strict secrecy and confidence is perhaps beyond doubt. They are working it in a systematic, compact and business-like manner with courage and caution combined. There may be those who are indifferent to it who would not however tell anything about it even if they happen to know something of it. There are again those who are perfectly innocent and honourable and who abhor it, but who are so timid by nature and training that they would say nothing about it to the authorities. There is always the fear on the part of these, and an honest fear that the consequences to them personally may be serious indeed if they become active and aggressive loyalists. The net result of all these is that the authorities are left practically helpless, and those who never dream of sedition and who in their heart of hearts have no touch of it have been as good as if they did not exist, so far as the practical work of suppressing sedition is concerned. *Then again there is this great sentiment coming in the way of the good men and true, and that is, that in waging*

war against sedition in a bold and honourable manner they are not only exposing themselves to a certain amount of risk personally, but they are given bad names by some of the most enlightened of their own countrymen occupying high and responsible posts under Government, who look upon this active and aggressive work of loyalty and loyalists as proceeding from a low and selfish motive. This is the most awful part of the situation. Active loyalists are given an unpopular colour while sedition passes for patriotism. As a matter of fact, however, nothing is more easy than to swell the current of anti-British feeling in the name of patriotism or prompted by personal discontent. In the Districts where sedition is rife, the secret organization is active, and the one point you invariably notice about these districts is no information can be had against sedition or its active workers and sympathisers, and active loyalists are either terrorised or vilified. The latest and worst instance of such seditious vilification appeared in the columns of "India" of the 30th June, in connection with the Ashe murder. You know "India" is published in England. The Editor of "India," like the Indian Editors of the red-hot school, has readily published this gross piece of libel in his paper without enquiry. I never thought that the policy of "India" was to lend itself to such libels against the Government and against people as honorable as himself and his compatriots. The murder of Mr. Ashe happened on 17th June, and the article in question appears in "India" *at the end of the month.* It could not therefore have been sent from India. It must have been written in England. It tries to account for the murder as due to the policy and action of the Madras Government!

Such a gross traversity of facts as this, is extremely un-English and unfair. It is both malicious and false. The British public at home must take the statements in question with a very large pinch of salt. But the person who deserves to be held criminally responsible for the libel is the correspondent who supplied the matter; because the Editor might have taken it on trust, though he must know the danger of accepting such silly stuff on trust. Such attacks would justify and warrant effective Press censorship both in England and India. Liberty of thought and speech under the British Government is fast degenerating into license, in some quarters, and newspapers in England whose aim is to serve the public, cannot be too careful about not playing into the hands of the seditious school.

The Native regiments are composed of illiterate or half-educated people, or people who could be urged in various ways and worked insidiously against the Government. If the secret society school establishes a foothold even in Native regiments, it must be awful indeed. The British officers may have no means of knowing what is taking place in their own regiments. The general public outside the Native regiments may also know nothing. And while the surface is calm as calmness and smooth as smoothness, a burrowing underneath has taken place here, there, or in a little corner and in by-ways and side-ways. The school-boys of any school, be it Government or Mission, managed by Europeans or Indians, may get affected in some little part of a corner without the masters knowing anything about it. If school-masters get into this body, and unfortunately here and there they too may have been caught in the net,

they become powerful centres of this cult. No wonder then that while the authorities are under the impression after one season of hunting down sedition, when it lifts up its head, that it has been cleared, and that they are going to have an era of peace in that quarter, the truth is they are perhaps only sadly mistaken. They have only taken hold of a unit here and a unit there, or some persons suspected of having something to do with it, but the root has not yet been got at nor its ramifications cleared!

The Native States are under the delusion that so long as sedition has not made its appearance in their dominions, there is nothing to be said about it there. But that is a mistake. The British Districts were all quiet and happy till a few years ago. They knew not anything like sedition. But some of them have come to be affected in a most unexpected manner. The Native States think in a general and vague way that there must be something wrong in the British Government to account for the seditious outbreaks, and they may think also that their own administration is so superior to the British rule that they are free from seditious thoughts on their side. But this idea is again a delusion. The tendency of sedition is to replace orderly and peaceful government, by mob-law and mob-rule. Once the mob, like the elephant, realizes its strength through the teaching of this school, it will pull down its Mahout, British or Indian. As for the idea that there are no grievances in the Native States like those under the British rule, and therefore they are free from the touch of sedition, they forget that sedition is not based upon grievances or no grievances, but that it is merely the idea of doing away with the Government,

and once it begins to work against the paramount power under whose guidance and protection the Native States thrive, they will not stop with the British Government but will make inroads on the Native States as well. If only the Native States would allow the preaching of seditious ideas half as freely as the British Government has done in the name of " liberty of speech and liberty of the press," it would not take very long before the phenomenon appears in the Native States as well. Grievances there are, and there will be everywhere. The Native States have their own grievances real or sentimental. *The underlying idea that works the whole mischief is that the method of getting rid of grievances is the use of brute force in one form or other.* Once this idea develops and takes hold anywhere, it is sure to work the same trouble regardless of facts and merits.

No Government in the world can get on once it is admitted that grievances real or imaginary would justify such outrages, and this method of settling grievances was foreign to the genius of India till now. And once it takes hold of the country, it will spread like wild fire among the people and establish itself and the simplest method of settling differences between man and man. The village factions and private and personal malice will take to such violent methods more freely than hitherto, following the example set by the seditious school. Once you take away the respect for human life which is deeply ingrained in the millions of India, and which has been built up during centuries of religious and moral influence peculiar to India, the result to the country at large is likely to prove terrible beyond description. Blackmailing and corruption will commence to rule, and rowdyism and brigandage will become the order of the day.

That anarchism cannot in its very nature hasten the pace of the country towards Swaraj or self-government in any form could be made obvious at once. A few murders here and there cannot certainly affect the general course of administration except for the worse by rendering measures against sedition only more and more necessary. The general sentiment of the country is too humane and just by instinct and too grateful to England to be at all affected by seditious outrages. The only way the general mind of the country is getting affectd by them is to increase their sense of abhorrence against such deeds and increase their powers of organization and persuasion against their repetition. So the revulsion of feeling against sedition is bound to be on the increase with such outrages. Anarchism is in its essence the tendency to blow up Government, law and authority. Out of such a tendency no good can come to any Government in the world, but it is bound to become a tendency in human nature—a menace to every Government foreign or native. Out of it, therefore, to expect Swaraj or self-government to come must strike every one as an impossibility of thought and expression. To make the position clear one need only realize the simple fact that the most heinous crimes like Thuggism, day-light dacoity, highway robbery or cold-blooded murder have never made one inch towards anything good. Are there not now all over the country any number of murders committed? Have they led to any good? How then are these political or anarchist murders going to produce any good?

A.—That is exactly what puzzles every one. Perhaps the idea is that such outrages will tend to deepen and widen the anti-British feeling and keep the rulers and

the people wider apart every day. That might be the purpose of such attacks.

R.—The result will be just the other way. Public feeling is likely to be roused more and more against such outrages committed on good and innocent people who have the best interests of the public at heart.

A.—Then what can be the motive of such attacks? They appear to be planned and organized and supported by numbers, infinitesimal as they might be, compared with the entire population. I am afraid the general attitude of the Indian press is not what it ought to be in such matters. They have got into the habit of characterizing such attacks as stray instances of political insanity and as conveying no great political significance, and even English papers would fain adopt the same view, because nobody wants to magnify the extent or limit of sedition, but the trend of seditious attacks hitherto both against Indian and English officers points to the conclusion that the school of sedition and anarchism is worked on certain organized lines and that it cannot therefore be treated lightly. The proper policy of the Indian press is to admit the existence of some sort of organization working this school and the necessity for clearing it up vigorously. It is a very erroneous and unwholesome policy for any responsible newspaper to treat such attacks as if they were only so many stray cases beginning and ending with the individuals concerned and having nothing more behind. Nobody wants to take an unduly alarmistic view, but what is happening is certainly not only alarming but is highly suggestive, especially in a country like India, where such outbursts have never been known in the course of history. But again and again one is tempted

to ask what could be gained by such madness on the part of the people who have been all along so law-abiding and loyal. From an India that never knew any such seditious outrages till quite recently, after nearly fifty years of peaceful and progressive administration, to the India of to-day with this blot of sedition on it, the change is one requiring serious thinking and explanation. I think the tendency to compare India with European countries in this respect is wrong, because anarchism is so foreign to the spirit of India that there must be something to account for this change and the real cause must be got at.

R.—I quite agree with that observation. There is a great deal of ignorance and misapprehension about the nature and extent of sedition. There is also the general disposition to treat the thing lightly as about the best way of getting rid of it. It may be that anarchism is yet confined only to an infinitesimal fraction of the population, but I cannot, after so many deliberate murders of an obviously seditious character, acquiesce in the policy of treating the affair lightly or of blaming the Government for taking stringent measures of repression. M.Ps. like Mr. Ramsay MacDonald and Mr. Keir Hardie are advocates of this policy. If they only lived in India and either administered a District or worked with Indians, they would not treat sedition in the light manner they have done.

A.—Yes ; Quite so. But what do you think of the real meaning and significance of the seditious movement?

R.—That is exactly what we have to get at, and it is by no means easy. You see how the perverse spirit

of sedition might misread even good books, "Ananda Mutt" and "Prince of Destiny" are both of them written by eminent Bengalees. "Ananda Mutt" is based upon the idea of Hindus overthrowing Mahomedan rule, and contains the scheme for a weak people to overthrow a strong Government. *The author of "Ananda Mutt" has distinctly said that the British must hold the country in the best interests of the people.* But the ideas propounded in the novel for the overthrow of the Mahomedan rule if adopted against the British Government by the unfriends of British rule, the result would be very much like the seditious movement of the day. The "Prince of Destiny" is a good book for its honest appreciation of the good side of the British Government and for its frank enumeration of its defects as well. The author pours out his fervent admiration for the British, while pleading warmly for a healthy change in the British policy towards the peoples and the princes of India.

A.—Yes. "The Prince of Destiny" did strike me as highly suggestive regarding the present situation. But I am afraid the author has failed to bring out the critical side of the people's condition, while he has pointed out with a masterly hand some of the main defects in the British policy. The picture therefore represents only one-half of the truth leaving the other half intact.

R.—I admit that it is so. But perhaps the reason was that the author was afraid that if he dwelt on the defects of the people as well as he has done about the defects of the Government, it may have the effect of not leading to the necessary change of policy in the British rule. While I adhere to my view that what is needed in India at

present is a great movement on the part of the people to inaugurate a healthy social and religious reformation, it should not be forgotten that a wise change of policy on the part of the Government is urgently needed to allay the public mind and to help the people's own reformation, because the people and the Government are but one body, and there can be no real antagonism between the rulers and the ruled. They are not two different bodies, nor are they two opposing bodies. That they are opposing bodies is entirely a western idea for which the school of thinkers like Herbert Spencer and John Stuart Mill is mainly responsible, though that school is now out of date and almost obsolete. At any rate, that school and the main ideas propounded by it are quite out of place in India which always looks upon the Government and the people as one composite and inter-dependent whole with identity of interests and no conflict whatsoever.

A.—But that is exactly the principle enunciated in the Queen's Proclamation of 1858.

"In their prosperity will be our strength. In their contentment our security: and in their gratitude our best reward." Is it possible to have a fuller enunciation of the principle of identity of interests between the British Government and the people of India than that contained in this ever memorable Magna Charta?

R.—I quite agree. But the great question has been there from the beginning as to how best to give effect to the Queen's Proclamation. There are two ways of giving effect to it, and they depend each upon the respective ideal to be aimed at by the Government. It was open first either to have the ideal of a limited form of Monarchy with a council of chosen men from the

people to help the Government or to have the ideal of self-government on the lines of Colonial Government. The two are radically different and would be governed by different principles of work. The former would be suited to the genius and traditions of the people of India and would be essentially monarchical, while the latter would be opposed to the Indian genius and traditions and require to be worked on Western lines of democracy. How much there was in choosing the one ideal or the other is now becoming patent in the light of facts. England chose the second ideal, that is, the democratic one instead of the monarchical one. This would appear to be the great initial blunder. English education was indispensable for both the ideals, and there is no need to quarrel with it. It is not so much English education that is to blame as the choosing of the democratic ideal. For instance, the Native States have found nothing incompatible between English education and the Indian monarchical ideal. If, however, England chose the democratic ideal, she ought to have considered beforehand the social and religious conditions of India and how far they should be changed for affording a basis for democracy. The assumption that without doing so, democracy could be planted on Indian soil was the great root mistake. The connection between the Indian social conditions and those requisite for democracy was entirely overlooked, and the democratic experiment has gone on steadily from the time of the Local Self-government scheme of Lord Ripon. The British Government never cared during all this time to study the social and religious side of Indian life. This amounted to pushing the democratic experiment in India

without a proper democratic basis to build upon. This fundamental error is bearing its natural fruit to-day. The people developed ideals and aspirations suited to the democratic form which the Government itself ushered expressly and impliedly in ever so many ways without realising the necessity for creating the conditions requisite for it, or, in other words, the antecedent social and religious reformation was dropped out of sight by both the people and the Government, and they both worked on the assumption that it would somehow come and that they need not devote themselves to it seriously. The antecedent conditions thus neglected for building a democracy upon, but the democratic form having been set on foot, we are to-day witnessing the conflict inevitable under such circumstances. Had the other ideal been chosen instead from the beginning, there would have been to-day no such conflict. The people were only told ever so often that they were not fit for political rights and privileges on democaitic lines, while they were taught to work for it as the deal. Was not this wrong radically? The people were made to believe in election and representation, and political agitation as their political means for attaining the political goal. So they went on developing the ideas suited to political agitation and demanded political rights and privileges on purely western lines. The Congress was a huge political agitation, and when divorced from social and religious reformation on a sufficiently large scale to leaven the people into anything like homogeneity or solidarity, it had in it the germs of trouble in the minds of those at least who bore no good will to the British. The spirit of assertion of political rights and political equality of a democratic character has been on

the increase without a corresponding development of the sense of civic responsibility on the part of the people whose great obstacle is to be found in the conditions of the people themselves. The spirit of political discontent, based not merely on administrative defects and grievances, but mainly on a passion for a Parliamentary form of Government to which the people were asked to look by the Government itself as the goal, led to the result that grievances against the Government were sought by the political press and the political leaders as the basis for political demands. The grievances multiplied, agitation increased, discontent spread, and the general idea that the British Government was becoming unpopular day by day and unsympathetic, came to fill the atmosphere. All this was due to the ideal set before the people by the Government themselves. The side of administrative efficiency of the British Government came to be lost sight of, and the sentiment of discontent became the prevailing note.

At the door of the Government was laid anything and everything. The policy of criticism in some quarters came to be from one of adverse criticism on constitutional lines to one of active hostility on purely racial lines. That the Government was not in a mood to grant reforms which it had taught the people to demand became the keynote of the school of hostility. The friction thus developed between the rulers and the ruled was brought to a climax in Bengal. Ideas like the growing poverty of the country under British rule, the exploitation of the country by the British capitalists and industries, and that even calamities beyond the control of man like failure of rain, famine, plague and other

epidemics, etc., were all due to the foreign domination under which the country was groaning, were spread first as the means of rousing public feeling in India and in England, and they spread like wild-fire among the educated classes who swallowed this political creed without question. The British Government and its methods came thus to be painted in the public mind in terribly dark colours, while the other side of the picture there was none to present. The Government allowed all this criticism freely without trying to meet it. It went further and shut the mouths of the Government servants and prevented them from correcting the wrong ideas. Thus the wrong ideas flooded the educated minds without let or hindrance. The Government servants themselves and the youths of the country became saturated with this politics as unquestionably correct. When this criticism against the Government and its methods went on for twenty years uncorrected, unopposed and unsatisfied, the idea took deep root that there was something rotten in the state of Denmark. Not only was this criticism not properly met by facts and figures at the proper time and in a proper spirit, but the attitude towards it came to be one of utter indifference under the notion that no danger could come out of it and that it was merely a process of getting rid of extra steam. And there were now and then good-hearted Englishmen or Irishmen who said jocosely that political rights could not be got for the mere asking, and they even went the length of saying that unless they adopted the Western methods of strike, etc., there was no hope. I am afraid this was the course of events that precipitated in Bengal the school of sedition and anarchism. Now all this was perfectly

avoidable. Had the other ideal been taken up, there would have been no school of political agitation against the Government. There would have been no fomenting of grievances. There would have been among the people of India, no such idea as that without agitation against the Government and without attacking its methods of administration, there was no political salvation for India. India, never accustomed to such political ideals and methods, but ever content to look to the Sovereign power for protection of her interests, was in no need for such ideas, and should not have been launched upon such turbulant political waters entirely unsuited to the Indian conditions and environments. While justification there can be none for sedition and anarchism, I am only tracing how far the political ideal set by the Government itself before the people is responsible for this unexpected state of things. When the public mind had been brought to such a pitch of feeling and sentiment against the Government, anything was enough to set things ablaze, and what was wanted was some pretext or other, and the Bengal Partition came in. We know the rest.

From this point of time the wildest of sentiments like Swaraj and Boycott came to fill the air. Anti-British feeling came to be spread, race hatred grew, bombs began, secret societies formed, seditious literature spread, and now we are face to face with the situation.

A.—Is it impossible to wipe out sedition without repression and establish friendly relations between England and India?

R.—I have always looked upon sedition as a mere wrong idea and as perfectly capable of being met by right

ideas. The Oriental method of dealing with sedition would be quite different. It is not the English method. It would proceed upon two or three clear and definite principles. First, it would make ample provision for the families of officers who come to an untimely end at the hands of seditionists. Secondly, it would devise substantial methods of recognising the services of all officers, English or Indian, who have a trying time of it in seditious tracts. The measure would be extended to all, who, whether official or non-official, literate or illiterate, rich or poor, render any substantial service in putting down sedition, in ferreting out seditious plots and in giving timely information about them to the authorities. The fabulous sums spent in prosecutions and trials for sedition might well be spent in helping the growth of aggressive loyalty among Indians as the one sentiment that should now go forward to guard the Sovereign power and their representatives. Loyal organs of public opinion should be encouraged, and the disloyal or seditious ones treated as they deserve. In Native States, such crimes and outrages will not be allowed to remain undetected for more than a few days. The usual time limit known to ancient India and conveyed to the Prime Minister is eight days. It is conveyed thus: "If before the eighth day, this is not cleared up such and such consequences will follow." The people will not rest quiet until the thing is cleared up. Another useful measure that would at once be adopted in Oriental Governments would be the peremptory exclusion from all honours, titles, etc., of persons who are known to be of a seditious turn of mind. The policy of the British Government in all these respects is weakness itself, and is entirely unsuited to the ideas of the

people. It has come to be so weak that no good man is safe. He has more difficulties to face than the false man, and yet he is left often enough in a state of suspense and doubt as to whether he is not getting on the whole rather knocked for all his troubles under the present British policy. This is a most serious defect requiring mending. One is afraid that the position of the British Government has come to be one of ignorance more or less regarding sedition. It is now in the mouth of every Indian that in spite of enormous details of information collected by the Government through some of its officers, the people now and then happen to know more about men and things regarding sedition than the Government itself! It is sometimes a wonder how about men and things the Government and the British Officers could make such mistakes. This ignorance on the part of the Government had led to two sad results in administration. As the Government does not know who could be trusted among Indians sufficiently they have grown so wary and distrustful that they perhaps think it best not to trust any one absolutely. Secondly, the people who are aware of the ignorance of the Government take full advantage of it by dividing the mind of Government by any number of contradictory opinions about men and things so that the Government does not know who could be relied upon and how to act. Not only many good men suffer for want of sufficient direct knowledge of the Government regarding them, but what is worse the false men, even in so serious a matter as sedition, not only escape the attention of the Government but even flourish! The people are laughing in their sleeves, that the Government is suffering most from divided

counsel and for want of direct knowledge of men and things. They know the thousand and one small ways and tactics by which the Government could be baulked in its efforts to get at the good men and put down the bad. I have heard it said that while on the one side, the policy of distrust has gone beyond all reasonable limits, it has, on the other, failed at times to get at the wrong men, and when they did get at them, it has not dealt with them in the way even our smallest Native States would have done. Is it any wonder then that the British Government is strangely enough, the only one to the Indian mind under which such weaknesses can prevail in the face of all warnings to the contrary! It is all well to say with a sort of nonchalance "Oh, that is our way; we let things go on till they come to a point. Then only we take note of it." All that one can say is there is neither prudence nor policy nor principle in such a course. And certainly not in a country like India with is accustomed to entirely different methods. What Native Governments would do perhaps by the officers assassinated by the hand of sedition be they Indian or English, is to grant them an adequate pension, say, for three generations. The effect of this would be very sound and far-reaching. It would show for three generations how the faithful men who stood by the Government were protected, and it would supply the courage to the timid, high or low, that if they die in the discharge of their highest duty to the Sovereign like stemming the tide of sedition, their families would not be left helpless. Officers cut off in the vigour of life with a large family behind, present too sad a plight. The heart of the most hard-hearted seditionist must bleed to see the poor widow and

the tender children stricken by one blow. It is a great point in Oriental systems of Government to mark out for special respect, recognition and reward, persons and families which render great and trying services to the Sovereign. Thousands therefore leapt fearless to guard the post of danger and duty alike, unhampered by prudential considerations of what may befall their families. Why instead of lacs being spent upon prosecutions and trials should it not be spent in this wise direction? The seditionist now sees that one crime or outrage of his puts the whole country in a state of fear. The boldest even have to think of the possible consequences of presenting a bold front in this insidious warfare against the hidden enemy who waits for his opportunity, watches his victim, and aims a cowardly blow at him when least expected. Is it not wise for a great Government to adopt the policy of not allowing within the pale of responsible situations those who do not realize the ingratitude of holding and spreading anti-British thoughts and convictions? It is well to remember that mere intellect is not to be honoured when it is associated with the seditious touch, because some of the cleverest and keenest intellects are perhaps unfortunately lured into the ring of this camp, and the best way of curing such men would certainly be not to ignore the latter in appreciating the former. Is it not true that it is the clever, intellectual and perhaps the over-clever and the over-imaginative on the wrong side, that have to be weaned? Honour by all means all who work *with* the British. Honour by all means those among the non-officials who adhere to the British Government and remember that in this hour of peril. England deserves at

the hand of every educated Indian his whole-hearted devotion. Honour by all means the honest and constitutional critics who, while pointing out the errors of Government for the betterment of the country, abhor anarchism and actively spread the cult of unity between England and India. Had the Government adopted the policy of honouring such friends, during all these years instead of leaving them more or less alone, who can say we would not have had to-day more men devoted to the British Raj and less of those who side with the seditious? The policy of throwing sops to the unfriends of Government as a means of appeasing them is disastrous, and must give way to the policy of standing by the friends. The seditious often point with a feeling of triumph to the unfriends of Government who have succeeded either in opposing and hoodwinking the Government as the capital weakness of the British on which they can rely and from which they can derive their very sustenance. They say point blank, "See how we can divide the Government and its friends, and show that to be popular with the mob-cry against the British rule serves to get a name among the people on one side while silently weakening the Government on the other." Is this not a bad policy to pursue? Such wise and prudential steps as those suggested above will meet with great opposition at the hands of the seditious as well as the sitters on the fence, and those who are adepts in the policy of hunting with the hound and running with the hare. They label hard and honest service with the name of sycophancy, and elevate sedition to the rank of patriotism in a thousand ways. The Government has to choose its policy definitely and unflinchingly. A few years devoted to the working of the right policy

sternly even as a trial will more quickly wipe out sedition and take its edge away than mere prosecutions which end in leaving the Government only the poorer financially and, far more morally, because every failure to prosecute a case of sedition successfully means an accession of strength to the cause of sedition, increase of unpopularity and odium for the Government and the general atmosphere getting more surcharged with unrest than before. A preventive remedy on Indian lines is what is perhaps best while repression is but a painful necessity, with not much of the elements of permanent cure in it. The remedies suggested above are more calculated to appeal to the Oriental mind as a powerful incentive to loyalty than quartering regiments or Punitive Forces. It is because the might and main of the British is admitted, and the British prowess and strength is acknowledged, that sedition has taken to by-ways and side-ways and to nook-and-corner attacks as the only means of spreading the maximum of terror with the minimum of strength.

CHAPTER VI.

THE BRITISH CHARACTER

AND

SOCIAL INTERCOURSE BETWEEN EAST AND WEST.

A.—Is social intercourse between East and West to be only a dream?

R.—The Hon'ble Mr. Gokhale has made a pronouncement on the question of social intercourse between East and West very recently, in which he says that it would not be possible except on the basis of political equality between the two communities. Mrs. Tyabji, wife of the late distinguished Judge of the Bombay High Court, said in 1903 at the annual meeting of the Indian Ladies' Club, "We complain that Europeans keep aloof from us, but that is largely our fault. I ask you how many among ourselves, Hindus, Mussalmans, or Parsees, want to meet together? Is it pride or reserve which keeps us apart? Is it not rather a difference in manners, habits, education, dress, language and religion?" "Let us," she added, "begin by union among ourselves." The Hon'ble Mr. Gokhale has thus come to assert now in so many words that the political idea of equality must lead, and that the social can only follow, but as against so great an authority like Mr. Gokhale, I can

safely pitch no less a person than the late Mr. Justice Ranade, with whom it was the social that was the first and the political only the next. There have been and there are two schools of thought in India all along. The one, the school of social reform, which may be called the social school, which, though small in number, is strong in its conviction that in the salvation of India, the social must precede the political reform. The other school which may be called the political school has been working on the principle that the political must precede the social. Most of the members of this latter school do not even believe that there is any necessary connection between social and political reform, so much so that you find to-day there are ultra-Radicals in politics all over the country who do not believe in social reform, and who are even strongly opposed to it. The school of social reform headed by such distinguished men as the late Mr. Justice Ranade, Mr. Justice Chandavarkar and others have led this school of thought. The motto of the social school may well be described as "*Liberal in social, Conservative in politics and Protestant in religion.*" The motto of the political school as deducible from its conduct is "*Radical in politics, Conservative in social and Orthodox in religion.*" I have deduced this motto of the political school from the conduct and creed of the majority of the people who constitute the rank and file of the political school, and not from that of the small minority of leaders of political thought. I can understand Mr. Gokhale if he had said that, from his point of view, social intercourse between East and West was not possible and that political equality to India should nevertheless be granted. I can understand his going further

and saying that he means to solve the problem of Indian self-government on the lines of Colonial Government with Indian conditions of caste and society more or less as they are and without any great changes being made therein, It would then be for the public to decide how far such a position would be sound or tenable. But to say that it is want of political equality between Englishmen and Indians that now stands in the way of social intercourse between them, is what must come upon every one as the greatest surprise, and especially when it comes from the Hon'ble Mr. Gokhale who has sat at the feet of Mr. Ranade!

The "Indian Social Reformer" says "Experience shows that a placid political atmosphere is most favourable to social and moral progress. It is this fact which compels the Social Reformer, in spite of himself, to intervene in political discussions with the object, if possible, of bringing about a better understanding between the people and the administration." The Social Reformer also adds that social reform has received a check from the shock the people got to their faith in the disinterestedness of the British rule, and that that shock has produced an anti-British feeling, and that the anti-British feeling has produced a feeling of indifference to social progress." I confess this baffles my comprehension, and I feel staggered by this process of reasoning, only all the more because the "Indian Social Reformer" is a paper for which I have so much respect.

A.—I cannot follow it either. Your social problems of which social intercourse with foreigners is only a part have been with you ever so long before the British, and they will be with you, for you to solve, even if the British

should quit India to-morrow. How then could it be said that any political inequality could hinder, or political equality could help, social intercourse between East and West? Social intercourse is only a means to an end. It is no end in itself. It is only a means to a correct understanding between Indians and Englishmen. Whereas a democratic form of Government is a great end in itself to be achieved by a people who believe in it and who bring about the conditions of fitness for it.

R.—Quite so. What stands now in the way of any intercourse between Hindus and Mahomedans? Is it want of declaration of political equality between them? What stands in the way of social intercourse between Brahmans and non-brahmans? Is it want of political equality between them? What stands in the way of sufficient social intercourse between the various sects of Brahmans themselves? Is it again want of declaration of political equality between sects? Anti-British feeling which is alleged by "the Social Reformer" to have come to stand in the way of social reform is the growth only of a few years. But our stagnation in social reform in defiance of the advance of the country in social ideas, has been our standing grievance during all the time the political atmosphere has been most placid. Till the Bengal Partition and the Surat Congress, there was nothing to disturb the political calm of the country, and yet till then were giant strides being made in social reform and did social reform get suddenly deflected over anti-British feeling? Is it not the bare truth that our slow progress in social reform has been all along due to the culpable indifference of the mass of the political school and our educated men alike, and their

refusing to realise the need for social progress and failing to bring up the necessary moral courage and numerical strength to solve the social problem? And is that not the true state of things to-day?

Now it cannot be denied that marriage reform is one of the foremost planks of social reformation. Among the educated men all over the country, what is the progress made in the fusion of sects and sub-sects by inter-marriages? Is it not yet very very small, and is it due to anti-British feeling? Is it anti-British feeling that comes in the way of inter-marriage between the Aiyars, Raus and Iyengars, or between the various sub-divisions of non-brahmans?

Take the Native States where there is no anti-British feeling, and where even social reform legislation has been introduced, as in Mysore and Baroda. Has marriage reform progressed by leaps and bounds there? So far as infant marriage and inter-marriage of sects and sub-sects are concerned, the state of things there is precisely like British India, and perhaps in some respects the Native States are even worse.

Under the British Government, political equality has been declared among subjects without any differences of caste or creed, and all are equal before the eye of law, and have equal rights and duties. Why has not this equality politically led to improved relations socially on anything like a sufficiently large scale? It is obvious that the real hindrance to sufficient social intercourse among the various classes of the people is more social and religious than political. The pinnacles of caste and the pinnacles of religion have been and are standing up in India for ever so long without any planks to connect

them. And when the Englishman comes to India, he finds that these pinnacles which are devoid of planks to connect them are even farther away from him. When the Brahman stands on his religious pinnacles and would have nothing to do with the Englishman socially, the Englishman naturally stands on his racial pinnacle. No amount of declaration of political equality will solve the social and religious prejudices of India. If to-morrow such a declaration is made, will that make for social intercourse between Englishmen and Indians one bit more on that account? Will it make the bigots and the orthodox among us relent one bit and give up their social ideas which are a part of their religion? I can understand Mr. Gokhale's position as a retort, but I fail to understand it as a reform. I can understand it if it means to assert a position like this towards the British Government, "If you want social intercourse with us, you must give us political equality. But if you do not give us political equality, we have no faith in social intercourse."

I however look upon social intercourse pure and simple between East and West as not only possible but as indispensable. If only the best of us on both sides would make it their principle of life to come together on the social side and understand each other, it will prove the golden bridge between the East and West. While Indians should hold India with one hand with all their love, they should hold England with the other hand in devotion, good-will and gratitude. Englishmen likewise should hold England with one hand in all that is best in her, and hold India with the other in a spirit of love and sympathy. England and India have both gained immensely by each other, and it is idle to try to settle accounts

and find out who has benefited more and who has benefited less. The truth is that the British rule in India deserves to be looked upon as a Divine dispensation in which the Western and the Eastern Aryan have come to meet after long separation, and they have to look upon each other as brethren well met. This is no mere fancy. England has come to rule in India a great and ancient but a fallen civilization. The Western Aryan is now at the zenith of his power and is justly proud of his present condition. The Indian Aryan, though fallen from his high estate, looks back to his great past and feels the inspiration of great ideas and ideals. While there is a great deal India has to learn from England in Western science, arts and industries, the ancient literature and philosophy of India has something in it that may lift India once more. So then, the proper attitude between England and India must be one of kinship *even racially*, and not one of antipathy. If when you are great and affluent you meet a long-lost brother of yours fallen and in adverse circumstances, what would your attitude be towards him? Would it be one of sympathy all the more for his fallen condition, or would it be one of haughty or supercilious indifference to him? After all, the duty of man to man and nation to nation in this world is merely for the higher to teach the lower and for the lower to learn from the higher. This is the end of all ethics and governments as well. So then, the task of uplifting India, however difficult, is yet the duty of England to fulfil. As the stronger, the more knowing and the more fortunate of the two to-day, it is again England's duty to bear with India nobly and patiently and not turn back from her mission. The hand has been set to the

plough in the wisdom of Providence, and let nothing take it away. There is a Sanskrit saying that the good man must be like the sandal-wood tree which emits only its sweet fragrance even to the wood-cutter who smites it. It is exactly in this spirit that the good men of England have been acting all along. It is in this spirit that Lord Morley's Reform Scheme has been given to India, notwithstanding the fire of bomb and revolver amidst which it was ushered.

Let me tell both Englishmen and Indians that good Government is not a question of mere muscle. If it were, there is plenty of muscle in India as there has always been, which however, could not hold the country. There is also plenty of brains in India. What is wanted, however, is a combination of both muscle and intellect. The Englishman is a combination of both muscle and brains. He can fight as well as write. But again, mere muscle and intellect will not do for good Government. Something more is needed. And that is, the moral force which would hold the balance evenly between conflicting interests and classes under a sense of duty for its own sake. The Englishman can fight, can write, and what is more, he can also hold the balance evenly. That accounts for his power in India. Smallness in number is thus made up for by this combination. Now the fourth stage is awaiting development. The fourth element is a spirit which enters into the genius of the country that has to be ruled and realizes the function of the ruler in the light of that genius. It is the want of this fourth element that is perhaps the cause of our present day difficulty. The struggle before us is, to my mind, nothing more than a struggle for the development of this fourth element in

our rulers and ruled. When we develop the fourfold combination in us, the result will be unity between the the rulers and the ruled. This combination is unlimited in its scope and illimitable in its endeavour and purpose! The ancient Aryan ideal in India represented this fourfold combination. The ancient Aryan, as seen in the heroes and heroines of the Ramayana and Mahabharata have shone out as embodiments of this fourfold combination. They represent in them the highest valour, the highest virtue, the highest intellect, and the world-wide spirit of sympathy and justice. This may well be the ideal to-day for both West and East. But this ideal having been departed from, has disappeared from the actual life of India, and her ancient writings now beckon to all who may read them to come under its sway and to drink once more from its deep and clear springs to renovate the world. It is really the highest Christian ideal and the highest Indian ideal as well. It is really the combination of the spirit of Jesus Christ and of Sri Krishna. It is the ideal which to-day we see in the best of Englishmen. The best of our Viceroys, Governors and Lieutenant-Governors, the best of our Civilians against whom Pagett, M. P., is so hard, and the finest of British soldiers and statesmen are all representatives of this ideal. When Lord Roberts after losing his son on the battlefield, proceeds to South Africa, to lead the British army, it reminds us of the heroes of the Mahabharata." When a Madras Civilian says while giving evidence before a Commission that Indians are fit for the highest places not excluding even that of the Viceroy, he is echoing his best instinct as an Englishman. When Lord Minto in his breadth of mind characterizes the

unrest as "the loyal unrest," he reminds one of the true Christian. When His Excellency, Sir Arthur Lawley, while in deep mourning, proceeds to visit the plague-camp in Coimbatore, to speak kind words of sympathy to the unfortunate sufferers, it strikes one as the noble spirit which forgets its own grief in ministering to the sick and suffering. Even so His Excellency, Sir George Clarke, of Bombay, proves his heart-power. When Lord Ampthill does the fight for Indians in South Africa, India is moved to gratitude! Instances can be multiplied from the history of British India of officers of comparatively humbler station than Viceroys and Governors, who have had to bear the brunt of Indian administration, in plague and famine, in riots and sedition, and who have given their very best, aye, their very lives in the faithful performance of their duty. Nothing would be farther from the truth than a wholesale condemnation of this body under the epithet "official bureaucracy."

But the fact remains that there is plenty of room for the British to develop this genius and breadth of mind to enter into the people's thoughts and feelings. It may not be possible for everyone to do so. The average man may find it too hard a strain on him, and so he would prefer the normal routine of officialdom. On the Indian side, the difficulty must be infinitely more to rise to this level, but the best of Indians and the best of Englishmen feel the kinship of thought and feeling. It won't do to condemn the British for the faults of a few. It won't do to condemn the Indians for the crimes of the mad or misguided here and there. It is the small men that are the cause of trouble. It is small things that to-day cause more irritation than big things. The

Railway incidents, the breach of etiquette, shaking or not shaking hands, the returning or not returning the visit to an Indian, be he an official or non-official, a Maharajah, Prince or Chief, it is these things that swell the torrent of ill-feeling. You cannot help in a big Government having some crusty and sour spirits, who like caste have become immobile. They are like the Orthodox Brahman who cries at every step of Reform "Church in danger." How many Indians have we who are suffering from class bias? How very sad that the best of gifts, the best of governments and the best of men, should all suffer for the faults and foibles of the mediocres! Can we not change these? Should it require a G. O. to point out etiquette? Etiquette taught at the point of a G. O. while showing the anxiety of the Government to set things right shows also that etiquette has come down so far as to require a G. O. to pull it up! It is admitted on all hands, that the British are, as a rule, strong, frank, and good. They are as a rule generous and just. Underneath a somewhat rough exterior they carry a warm heart. But how few Indians, even among the educated, have made a close study of the British in a spirit of disinterestedness? We want them to move with *us* closely and *yet* few of us have cared to move with them closely. And the pity of it is, the social gulf between us makes understanding each other so difficult. How to bridge it? Whose fault is it that Indians and Englishmen have not yet come together sufficiently to understand each other? It is the social system of each that accounts for it. There is the hide-bound social system of India from which the great majority of even the educated Indians have not emerged. That was not the social system of ancient India. It was not the system of

Arjuna and Sri Krishna, but yet the sentiment and prejudice of the day is, as if the ancient Aryans were divided into sects and compartments of implacable isolation and opposition to each other. Then again, the position of Indian women to-day is another great point. It was not the position of the ancient Aryan. The Aryan women even like the British to-day were learned and free, but under different ideals perhaps. Nevertheless, if only the Indian women could be brought up to the level of the ancient life of India, there would be no difficulty for the women of India and the women of England meeting on the friendliest of terms. *The western social life is the direct antithesis of Modern India, mark you, not of ancient India, in these respects.* Ancient Indians, men and women, would have met the British in social intercourse infinitely more liberally, I fancy, than Modern India. *So then, the Indians have to advance towards better social ideals from the point of view of their own ancient social polity.* For the Britisher the centre of life is woman, the club and the dinner-table. For the Indian also at one time the centre of life was woman. Without woman to guide and help, he was not fit for the life of "*Grihastha*" or "*house-holder.*" Woman was the mistress of the house "*Grahini.*" Marriage made man and woman one whole, half of which was the husband and the other half, the wife, It is exactly like the word "*better-half*" in English. The chivalrous sentiments of the West are all entombed in the ancient life and writings of India, but now this real life of India is too clouded to be visible. When it comes out of the cloud, the points of contact will be many between England and India. It is to this end we have to work.

A.—Do you believe that England and India would come to intermarry freely at any time?

R.—I do not believe in such marriages. I do not believe that they are possible, very largely, nor do I think they are desirable. Herbert Spencer looks upon it as a Biological question. *He said that marriage is healthy beyond certain limits, but it must be also within certain limits. Nature is neither for marrying too close nor too far. She is for a healthy medium.* The present Indian marriage system has erred on the side of marrying within too close limits. *The other extreme of trying experiments in matrimony between persons divided by half the world's girth, or by social customs and religious sentiments which are a perpetual note of opposition to each other, is bound to prove as great a failure as the other extreme.* Let each society and nation develop on its own lines to the highest point, and let them nevertheless break through all stupid barriers to social intercourse. Let each develop all that is best in Art and Life. Let Indian communities and classes learn to develop the highest possible social unity and social efficiency. Let again the Indians and Englishmen learn to develop the highest possible social unity among them.

The immediate, practical and pressing problem for Hindus is the fusion of sects and sub-sects of the various castes by inter-marriages and relieving foreign-travel from the trammels of custom and prejudice, and basing it on the broad principles of Hinduism. These changes, simple as they are, will demand the utmost nerve and strength of all true Indian leaders in the field of religious and social reform. When we see that Hindu society is not yet prepared even for these simple measures, and that

caste and sect prejudices still sway the minds of educated Indians who are wedded to orthodoxy and who would even persecute the social Liberals, a bill, like the Hon'ble Mr. Basu's Civil Marriage Bill, cannot but be looked upon in India as attempts too revolutionary to prove useful. In social matters, reform from within must be more the aim of practical workers than reform at the point of Legislation. Legislation can at best serve only as a hand-post showing the direction, but it cannot compel an unwilling people to take the road. Here are words pregnant with wisdom uttered by His Excellency, Sir Arthur Lawley. They are so true, so eloquent, and so much to the point, that I give them. He said, speaking at St. Andrew's Dinner of 1910, in Madras:—

"Take for example these Constitutional Reforms. We borrow from England a system, a polity whose foundations are the work of centuries of popular and democratic evolution, and we apply it to a particular communism in which caste is the basic principle of every indigenous system, whether political or social. I have no desire whatever to disparage the ancient institutions of Hinduism, but around that venerated and wonderful system known as "caste" have arisen prejudices and forms and procedures which have become anachronistic, out of date, and sadly out of harmony with modern ideas of progress and civilization. It is the removal of the unwholesome excrescences which have grown out of the caste system that I so earnestly desire. Some of them have taken the form of customs which find observance in Hindu society and accord ill with the principles and ethics which give inspiration and motive power to our educational system, so that it seems well nigh impossible

to bring the liberal spirit of a Western School into harmony with the conservative spirit of the Eastern home. Or again in social matters? Look at the gulf between East and West? In what way is it to be spanned? By what means is the chasm to be bridged? To this question I can find no answer so long as rigid exclusiveness is insisted on by the old world code of social observances which still regulates Hindu life. It is not the caste system that I would demolish, but the walls of prejudice and suspicion which have been built around that system to bar the ingress of modern thought and science and progress. It is for this that I would earnestly plead to my Indian friends, far beyond the walls of this room, that they should rally their forces to the advancement of social reform, if they really desire to draw more closely the bonds of friendship and sympathy between rulers and ruled; if they would render the Indian home more capable of assimilating the liberalizing spirit of Western education, and if they would ensure a satisfactory answer to the question "How will the new Reforms succeed?"

That is a big question. For myself I believe they will succeed. I want them to succeed, as I am sure every Englishman does who has the welfare of India at heart, and I am confident that each one of us will use his utmost endeavour to ensure that they shall be successful. But, as Lord Minto has truly said, it is upon the people of India and their leaders that the future depends. And that is why to-night I have ventured to put forward however crudely and cursorily, the plea that the next great advance may be on the part of the Indians themselves and in the direction which I have indicated. I know

that infinite courage, infinite toil, and infinite patience are demanded of those who would scale the citadel of caste and plant on its topmost pinnacle the banner of social reform, but great will be their reward.

Those who have not the heart for this great work could hardly find justification at the bar of their own conscience.

But it cannot be denied that it is to-day quite possible for the Indians and Englishmen to have a system of social intercourse, provided they are prepared to meet each other half way. The Indians are fast giving up the ideals of "Don't Touchism" and "Don't Seeism." In Europe, vegetarian dinners and vegetarian restaurants are not wanting. At vegetarian dinners Indians and Englishmen may well meet. At even mixed dinners the vegetarian side may have its place. Social gatherings are now quite common where meat has no place. The "cup that cheers but does not inebriate" is the centre round which all may meet. The Indians must be prepared to meet freely and frankly at such parties. If they cannot get over their prejudices even so far, they cannot claim social intercourse. It is the spirit of friendliness that is of the essence of social intercourse. With Englishmen sociality without touching the stomach is absurd and uninteresting. There can be no friendliness in the misanthropic aloofness that tabooes everything down to a cup of tea. There can be no genuine conversation and hearty exchange of thoughts without some social cement which binds all without difference. The spirit of aloofness leads to unsympathy and unsympathy is misunderstanding. The Englishman wisely tabooes the personal element from social and

convivial moments. "Talking shop" is the height of social offence. Wrangling and discussion is an unsociable thing. The average educated Indian knows not what it is to avoid unpleasant and controversial topics or to avoid "talking shop" or avoid trying to push the self in social moments when men are supposed to breathe the air of disinterested and selfless calm and pleasure. A pleasant half-hour every evening dissociated from the cares of self or the pricks of life is the ideal of English club life. In an English club a few healthy rules make for the club life, and woe to him who breaks them. Respect for each other's feelings, respect for the harmony of the entire body and the spirit before which the Colonel and the Subaltern are equalized, these constitute the essence of English club life. There is no clique there by twos and threes. There is no talking against each other there. There is no party spirit there which mars the general concord. There is nothing like consciousness of power or office in club. All are equal, and woe to the man who betrays any touch of self-consciousness. Implicit obedience to these ideas and principles form the basis of English club life. Into an Indian club you go, and in two days you know who are particularly thrown together and what they talk about day after day. The same twos and threes come together as by some spirit of schism. But in an English club, you cannot make out which two are more particularly attached to each other than which other two. They are all so clubbable that you only know you are one of the lot, and your function is to make others happy and find your own happiness in that of the club life in general. If two are at Billiards, others may not shout and talk but may only look on. Others may not

even walk except gently so as not to disturb the players, Peace and quiet, mirth and jollity, play and fun, these are the elements of club and clubbability. The Englishman's definition of home is "peace and comfort." His club is the place to recoup the lost energies and cement good feeling. We have yet to learn club life. Is it to be had by compelling others to open the door for us on pain of newspaper attacks? What a silly idea? Is it to be had for commanding a gentleman to propose you, and if he does not, exclaim "see, how badly I am treated!" No, a thousand times, no; it is not to be had for forcing the doors open. It can be had with the gentle touch, and what is conveyed by the qualification "gentlemanliness," at once so easy and difficult. A thousand little things and details of cheerful self-abnegation go to form the "gentleman." Once in a Railway journey I happened to meet a Civilian of a well-known English family, who defined "gentleman" and brought under the definition all that was good and noble. He went on pointing out the traits of a "gentleman" from the collar and the neck tie. But he did not stop with these superficialities. He went on and on, and pointed out how a "gentleman" was the very soul of honour and virtue, and how in the midst of wealth and power he was but a kindly man moving amongst his kind, absolutely unconscious of self. He pointed out how a "gentleman" was the very pink of courtesy, and how he should be ashamed of himself if he did not wish properly his very gardener or syce. When I told him how his code of gentlemanliness was broken in India, he simply said: "such people are not gentlemen." I pointed out to him that while I had come across so many who were unexceptionable for true

gentlemanliness, there were those who were far from the mark, and they were responsible for irritation and friction. Those who curse and swear, who do not even return a good morning properly, who are supercilious in their behaviour, who think rough-riding and bad manners a symbol of authority, and who in the Railway journeys "damn the niggers" and won't travel in the same compartment with them, these are the worthies who have brought discredit on the fair name of England. There must be all over the world persons of this class. You find them in every society perhaps. Each society has its own scums who "boss it over the show." It is in the blood. All well-bred men, all the world over, are the same in gentle and good manners. I, for one, can look with pride and pleasure on my social moments and social calls with Englishmen all these years, and say that on the whole, I have had only a pleasant and interesting time of it. The mishapen units of the West with whom I had an unpleasant experience I can count on my finger ends, while the number of those Europeans, civil and military, official and non-official of the right side, I can re-count by scores. Not a few of these have been persons of the highest station, calling and birth; and it is such a pleasure and instruction to meet them. It is from them one learns to appreciate and admire the British. Their life and example are so high and inspiring, so noble and generous that it is only bare truth to say, that we have to work up a lot to come up to that level of thinking and feeling. It is not for us to appreciate ourselves. It is for others to tell us what they think of us. The British are adopting a wrong policy in saying all the good things about each other at dinner-tables and at political functions

exclusively European. It would be more appropriate if *we* said it about *them.* Likewise it won't do for us to blow our own trumpets and say we are equal to anything. It is for others to say what we are good at. This is the end of all true social function where politics and prejudice are eliminated. I might just point out how Englishmen differ from us. The average Englishman is strong and insular. One has to get at him. Whatever he comes to hold, he holds strongly. His likes and dislikes are strong, but, as a rule, they are honest. If it is hard to dislodge him from his opinions, there is his other trait coming to his rescue, and that is, his frankness. If he is shown to be in the wrong, he at once makes amends for his mistakes. The Englisman carries the palm for appreciation of merit wherever found. He is fair and generous. An English Military Officer writing from England to an Indian said: "Give my salaams to all—including my syce and grass-cutter." It is England's just pride that they extend the right hand to merit. They are just and generous in their estimate of men. As a matter of fact, to-day they are giving us more liberally than what Indians themselves are prepared to concede to their own countrymen! This must sound strange, but is true nevertheless. Take club life for example. The Indian has to confess that club life has not yet come to him as it has come to the Englishmen. It is slowly coming here and there. But it is yet in the coming; it has not yet come. Everyone feels the superior powers of organization of the British, be it for pleasure or profit, conquest or administration, courage and self-sacrifice, or a lofty sense of duty and genuine patriotism. Everyone feels that in spite of our efforts to

organize and co-operate all these years, we are just learning the first lessons in the art of combination and co-operation, in sacrificing smaller interests for larger ones and in sinking the personal to the public side of life. The Indians must run their clubs on the principles of the English club. In the meanwhile, the Englishmen must slacken a bit of their icy coldness towards Indians and throw their clubs open to them. That is one way of helping social intercourse. See how Free Masonry has brought the two together. It is marvellous. The key-note is harmony, and he who is not up to it and cannot tune himself to it is lost. One hour of this intermingling of hearts is worth a hundred sermons and a thousand lectures which bore you to death.

Why do Englishmen display a general aversion to admitting Indians to their club? You say it is race-bias; but that is only part of the truth. It is also a fear that the peace of the club life might be rudely broken by ignorance and want of delicacy of thought and expression. But that might be got over easily, provided the Indians would conform to the rules of the English club, and the Englishmen would meet the Indians on a friendly footing. As it is, English club life is, on the whole, unduly rigid and exclusive. It looks very much like the exclusiveness of the Indian caste. Those who are waging war against the exclusiveness of caste cannot but deplore the consequences of exclusiveness of the English club life as having a tendency to keep up race-bias. It can do no good. It has done and is doing great harm. How to minimise it must be every good man's concern.

I know of one Indian club at least where the insoluble difficulty is "Touch not the Brahman cup; for the

non-brahmans, there is another." The non-brahmans have broken away as a matter of self-respect. It is high time something was done by the Englishmen and Indians towards a common club life. Because I believe that the English club life, if thrown open to Indians, is bound, in the long run to make for a proper and correct understanding between the two classes. To the Indian, it will prove an education in itself. To the Englishman, he would understand the Indian better. The fear that some undesirables may get into the club is the fear that must apply to all classes. Does not one often hear of the unclubbables among Europeans? But they are not tabooed. They are either tolerated or only made to find their level. In one English club, I know that almost all the countries of Europe were represented. It was a most miscellaneous club so to speak. Even Europeans bearing no friendly feelings towards England and with no qualifications worth the name, and with even one or two positive disqualifications, were free to be members of this club. But no Indian would perhaps have been admitted. But side by side with it and as a keen contrast, there was another club composed of the finest elements of English club life. It was there, I found what club life was, and whata delight it was to spend one's evenings there. I found that the real attraction of the English club life lay generally in its heartiness, freedom and harmony.

CHAPTER VII.

BRIDGE-MAKING.

R.—Let me emphasize that without England we could hardly realize this great ideal of ancient India. Without England again we can hardly work it. Nay, without England, we could barely prepare the ground for it. Literally then and without any figure of speech, in turning away from England or breaking with her, we are kicking the ladder by which we ascended, while hardly we have got on the first rung yet, and when we have ever so many rungs to ascend before becoming anything in the world. But England has to begin the most trying of her task with India just now. This is the hour and the need, for the hour is felt all round, but the Englishman has not yet realized it, and is puzzled at the situation and knows not what to do. The seditionists are in a fit of madness and forget the need for the guiding hand, and think it can do without England. A mighty effort is needed on the part of both England and India in facing the situation. There is no use regretting the past. There is no use trying to re-write on the slate of the past what might have been written on both sides. It is vain speculation, and it is wisdom, perhaps, to recognize that there is not to the thoughtful mind much room for regret because on the whole, England and India have both done splendidly together. Is it not silly to think of mending the past

without working in the present? Is it not silly to hold up the picture of wrongs and weaknesses on both sides, instead of pointing out the strong and good points on which alone the future can be built? It is easy to write any amount of partisan literature to belittle England or blacken India. But truth is neither there nor here. Seditious literature is carefully planned on the principle of writing England and Englishmen down to a terrible indictment before the world or before the young. It is as easy to write down India for all its past weaknesses and wrongs. It is again easy for the political press of the bitter partisan type on both sides to indulge in mutual recrimination and fault-finding so that the result might be more of distance between the two countries and less of kinship. But no good can come out of such a policy. One is tempted to exclaim, "save us from the political partisan press, be it Indian or Anglo-Indian," but it is this dreadful game played by the political partisan press all over that is now bearing the bitter fruit. The Englishman is naturally trustful and simple. But the Indian is by nature distrustful even with his own countrymen. The Englishman finds that his trustfulness and simplicity are taken undue advantage of, and says he should have nothing to do with people who have not been prepared to see his good side and who would only see the dark spots in him. He then exclaims in a spirit of despair, "I have trusted so long and worked so hard and yet the result is discouraging." The Indian says in return: "This is hard lines. However trying it might be, it is still true that trust begets trust, and distrust distrust." Let there be room enough for all of us who would cling ever and anon to England and who would still link England and

India together. Let England know that even while under the greatest trial she must know her friends from her foes. Let the best of us be admitted freely and frankly into her counsel and let us work together in a spirit of true comradeship without any difference. *It is not so much a question of place or preference, but it is pre-eminently a question of confidence between the rulers and the ruled. It is a question of recognition of the priniciple of true Imperial unity between England and India.* Thus the units among Indians who belong to the school of Imperial unity have in them the true cement for the process of bridge-making between England and India. But I am told that it is not so easy to make out friends from foes. I am also told that while those who have openly declared hostility against the British Government are easily understood, the difficulty is in finding out who constitute the rank and file of the following of the seditious school. But all the same, the policy of suspicion and distrust is not to be carried too far. I know what it is for a handful of foreigners ruling over millions to find at a time of trial and trouble in administration, that those on whom they could depend are after all so few, and I know from personal experience what it is to be served badly by our surroundings in matters of the highest administrative well-being for the public at large. I know some of the most sympathetic and kindly of officers whose whole service will bear the strictest scrutiny for British sympathy and fair-play, who trusted their surroundings to help them at a time of sore trouble and unrest, but who got in return nothing but bitter disappointment. The result of such experience cannot but make even the best of us, Indian or English, feel that

we do not know where we are, but yet I know of no other way of getting over the difficulty except by mixing more freely with the pick and flower of Indians and try to understand them. Fifteen years ago in writing to "The English Magazine and Review" about "Englishmen and Englishwomen in India," I pointed out the disastrous consequences of want of mutual understanding between the rulers and the ruled. I went the length of saying that a G. O. may well be issued stating that at every important station there should be a mixed club of Europeans and Indians, which all *officers* at least would be expected to foster and develop. Then again, I pointed out years before the sedition-troubles that the signs of the times proved more than ever the necessity for a correct understanding between the rulers and the ruled. Had only something been done all these years by both Indians and Englishmen to bring about a certain amount of fellowship and good feeling so as to bring the best of us together somewhat on the basis of Free Masonry, we should not be to-day still discussing the problem of social intercourse and despairing alike about its solution; but it is never too late to try the good experiment. Now more than ever, there is need for it. Instead of growing hopeless over the situation, there is yet any amount of room for Indians and Englishmen to set themselves about making the bridge. Because the number of those who could be relied upon is small at a given time, it does not follow either that this number could not be increased, much less that even they should not be taken into confidence unreservedly. There is an erroneous idea among some that the best way of working sedition out is to work it entirely through British instruments trusting as little

as possible to the Indian. This is radically wrong. In war, in sport, in administration, and in putting down sedition, the best of Indians and the best of Englishmen, British soldiers and Indian sepoys, have to work in true comradeship. The knowledge of the Indians, side by side with the grit of the British, can alone face the situation. Wherever I go, be it in British India or Native States, the one thing I hear from the highest of Indians, official or non-official, is the need of the moment for this feeling of comradeship between the British and the Indians. There are so many who would serve, but the best of them feel that somehow or other there has not been enough of confidence reposed in them. By all means, choose your officers and men, but having chosen them, trust them even as you do your own men. If even the best of us who would gladly give or who have gladly given any amount of proof of fidelity to England be made to feel by some of your own officers as if even they should be kept at a distance, is it not sad? Be it noted that what the anarchists probably want is exactly to undo the bridge and widen the breach. Nothing would perhaps more gladden the heart of the seditionist than to see the rulers and the ruled cut off without touch and trust, but that is the very reason why the doors must be thrown open for the best men on the Indian side to come into the Chamber of State and the Chamber of local administration so that sedition might see that in spite of its efforts to undo the bridge, the process of bridge-making will go on only all the more vigorously. One is often tempted to explain with the author of "The Prince of Destiny" "O England, I hardly know what to do. While there is so much to admire in Thee for all that is

great and good, there is so much to deplore for thy faults and failings!"

A.—I must say that your tribute to England is touching. With more men of your creed, I should never despair of making the bridge; but what do you consider to be the chief of these faults and failings?

R.—Foremost among them I would say is Red-tapism. *The one great rule which is above all rules, is that the object of rule is to help justice and good government.* Red-tape must give way before truth and justice. Too much of rules and red-tape are likely to reproduce in grim reality the story of the doctor, who pronounced a living man on board dead, and there was no help for the living man who was explaining that he was alive except to be thrown overboard, because the doctor had pronounced him dead! I know of a Municipal Secretary—and he was only the type of this class of red-tape men, and he used to give endless trouble to the Municipal administration by his remarkable knack for applying G. O's. and B. P's. so as to work hardship. He had, besides, the knack of offending everybody. The Municipal Chairman was a good old Divisional Officer, who for want of time had delegated all his powers to this unpopular Secretary. Plague was raging in the neighbourhood. Passport holders were pouring into this place where this Municipal Secretary was holding sway. To bring things to a climax, a banya shop had to be disinfected on account of suspected plague infection. The Secretary went to do the disinfection one morning with his buckets and thotties and his belted knights, each with a cane in hand which is an emblem of Municipal authority. Within a few minutes after the Municipal staff reached the shop, a menacing

mob, thousands strong, composed of Mahomedans and Hindus, surrounded the Municipal Secretary! The axles of the wheels of his cart had been removed and the Municipal Secretary was, by no means, in an enviable position. He had the good sense to send word to the Municipal Chairman. He was there at once on the spot, and he took the situation in at a glance. All he could do was to make up his mind that it required firmness and tack, and that it would be disastrous to show the white feather. It would have been equally so to plunge precipitately into tactless measures. He kept parleying with the mob on the one side, and sent information to the Police and the District Magistrate on the other, taking care that it did not leak out on the way. Shortly after, came the Police and the District Magistrate who was an Indian. The mob began slowly to disperse, and they were told what a simple thing it was that was going to be done for their benefit, and proceeded quietly to do the disinfection. The thing ended quietly. When it was found that more than half the cause of the trouble was due to the previously piled up acts of odium and unpopularity of this red-tape Municipal Secretary, the first thing the Chairman had to do was, after consulting the District Magistrate, to relegate him strictly to the desk as his proper place, and take the administration himself. He commenced obstructive tactics. He would send him bundles of papers for disposal to frighten him by their bulk. He would next point out in the name of G. O's. and B. P's. how the Chairman's orders were wrong. But the Chairman found more often than not that while his quotation was correct, his misapplication was due either to ignorance or worse. He had only one of two courses

open to him either to strictly limit his functions or to allow the administration to become a scandal. He did the former, and I should think with nothing but good results. The less we have red-tape of this sort in administration, the better will it be for all concerned.

While red-tape is a weapon which many a desk-man may wield innocently, it must not be forgotten that it is very often wielded by the vicious underlings in all departments. It is remarkable how the Sheristadar, either of a Collector or a District Judge, may carry point after point cleverly and ingeniously in spite of all the care you take. A high-placed civilian, remarkable for his strength and commonsense alike, told me very humorously how he once got tired of the tactics played by petty men in the name of petty rules, to the detriment of good men and good government alike. He told me how he had come across subordinate officers who tried to prevent him in following the healthier and higher principles of administration in the name of following minor rules. He said, "whenever rules, G. O's. and B. P's. were pointed out to me as a piece of obstructive tactics, I always overcame them by saying that the rules were all meant to help and not hinder the right thing or the right man, and that when they were sought to be applied to hinder the right thing or the right man, the best thing was to disregard them." This spirit is badly needed in solving many an administrative problem, where the Government is sought to be put into the meshes of the letter of the rules at the cost of the spirit. The extent to which Red-tapism has permeated almost all the departments of administration is astonishing, and the grim humour of the situation is that those who perpetrate it, are hardly conscious of it.

The evil has gone so far as to affect even departments which might be well expected to be free from it. Scrupulous conformity to *mamool and red-tape* has come to invade us so completely that any deviation from it, however essential and desirable in the public interests, is looked upon almost in the light of a calamity! The heads of all departments must rise above it and infuse a new spirit in administration. Red-tapism cannot be more aptly described than as the spirit of caste crystallized in officialdom. Just as Hindu Society wants its small doors and windows to be replaced by bigger ones so as to admit more light and air, even so, should the official doors and windows be replaced by bigger ones so as to let in plenty of fresh air and light. A great deal has been done by the Government in the right direction, and what is wanted is the attitude of mind on the part of all concerned which would welcome the change instead of offering it resistance, as if a healthy deviation from *immemorial usage* would bring down the very Heavens on our head.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE BRITISH POLICY.

A.—What are the defects in the British policy and what are the changes needed therein?

R.—This is the most vital and yet the most difficult problem to solve. But solved it must be, for on that depends the fate of India. Indian political parties are yet nebulous. The names of the British political parties can bear no very close resemblance to the names of the Indian political parties. Any conclusion or comparison based upon mere fancy or superficial similarities between the parties here and the parties there, can lead to no practical good. It will only tend to obscure our vision regarding the vital points of difference between the British politics and Indian politics. The British political parties have for their basis the way in which their social, industrial and political interests are affected by them. So before the British political parties could bear any vital resemblance to the Indian political parties a great and radical change must take place in Indian sociology. The terms "Liberals, Conservatives, Socialists, Unionists," etc., have no meaning in Indian politics. That is why the party politics of England ought to have nothing to do with the Indian administration. India must be above party politics. That is why the best of rulers and

administrators in India must quickly eschew their pet principles or prejudices of party politics and must apply themselves to work out the best form of Government for India agreeably to her own genius, traditions and conditions. The distinction between Conservatives and Liberals has been really wiped out in the Indian administration, because Liberals or Conservatives coming to India had to leave aside their respective political creeds and work on what seemed to them best for the good of India. So the idea of linking India with any particular party in England as alone conducive to its progress and prosperity will turn out on examination to be unfounded. In fact, the Liberals may be opposed to the Conservatives and think that Conservatives deserve only to be thrown overboard. That is English politics. But in Indian politics the truth may be that Conservatives have done more good to India than Liberals. It is a very common thing in India to mistake that the Liberal in English politics is likely to be more friendly to India than the Conservative. This is due to a sort of vague notion in the Indian mind that the word "Liberal" imports "progressiveness" while the word "Conservative" denotes the opposite. The truth is perhaps that great and illustrious names may be mentioned of Englishmen whether Liberal or Conservative who have proved themselves friends and benefactors of India without regard to any difference in their political creeds. This is the tendency that India requires from all Englishmen who love India and have no idea of propagating their own political creed here. Taking the words "Conservative" and "Liberal" not in the worst sense, but in their very best, the word "Conservative" should mean

the principle of conserving whatever is good in the present, while the word "Liberal" may import the principle of taking a step in advance though at the cost of breaking a bit from the old moorings. This is the right side of Conservatism and Liberalism. The wrong side of Conservatism is to cling to whatever is old or ancient regardless of merit or worth, while the wrong side of Liberalism is to break everything old and ancient in an Iconoclastic or Utopian spirit. India is pre-eminently conservative both in the right sense and in the wrong sense. It clings to its past with intense devotion. It will not yet give up a great many things which are injurious to her and whose sole merit is that they are old. India is now coming to realize more and more fully the right side of Conservatism and the necessity for preserving Indian life and polity at its best on ancient lines of Indian thought and wisdom. If India succeeds in passing from her wrong Conservatism of ages to the right Conservatism of ancient India, it would be true to her national instincts. That is apparently the trend of India's future, as it strikes the most thoughtful of minds. Now the present tendency of British politics is just the other way. It is beginning to lose itself into the Liberalism of the wrong type. It is fast descending into the abyss of socialism which India will never accept. England herself cannot stand it for any length of time. It is like the attempt to make the cone stand on its apex. India is too sound, too old and, if I may say, too wise for socialistic experiments. England herself will pass through the wave of socialism and when it comes to the crest, will have to veer round somewhat violently to Conservatism of the Indian type. I have an idea that the West

itself will some day have to adopt the Indian ideals of polity when it is tired of all her experiments in the school of socialism and when it finds that, as long as the world lasts there is no equalizing the Newton and the idiot, and therefore the theory that every man is as good as another or which comes to the same thing as bad as another is in politics the most misleading and dangerous of doctrines. It is just possible that the most democratic of countries in the West may come to adopt in course of time a system of Oligarchy or a limited form of Monarchy as about the best. At any rate, in the Eastern horizon and in the Eastern hemisphere this form of Government alone bids fair to be a success. The Sovereign in the East is like the sun which can never be dimmed by the satellites and stars. The great question, therefore, is whether when one country rules another, the ruling power should study and follow the genius of the country it rules, or whether it should try its own experiments in the main departments of life. Till now the British Government has been following in her methods too much of the Western forms paying no heed to the Eastern ideals. This has proved a source of weakness and trouble. The unexpected has happened. The representative form of Government was ushered by the British rule, bit by bit in ever so many ways. It was put in the Municipal Councils and Local Boards as a scheme of Local Self-Government. It was put in the election of Devasthanam Committees for electing members. It was put in the Legislative Council, for helping the Government with its criticism. It has come to dominate us in the form of non-official majorities. Having thus created the frame work of representative Government, the spirit of the people demands the fruition

of that form. This is only natural. Having tasted of the popular form of Government and having been taught to look upon it as the political ideal to be reached, the people want more and more of popular power and less and less of official control. The village Reddy whose vote was till now solicited, is now looked upon as an unnecessary and troublesome official appendage. Even the Tahsildar is likewise spurned. The higher functionaries share the same fate. The people exhibit the spirit of impatience of official control and wish to do away with it. This is all well and good if the people could manage their affairs with the high character and disinterested devotion to public interests which could ensure efficiency and freedom from corruption in the absence of any official control and guidance. Otherwise Local Self-Government could not pass beyond the stage of generous experiments at the cost of efficiency and discipline. Popular power and popular character are not necessarily synonymous with each other. The development of popular character should be the first to aim at before the popular form could succeed. The Native States seeing the difficulty under Eastern conditions of developing popular character on a large scale have wisely given it up as a hopeless task and adopted their own lines of progress and efficiency. But the spirit of the British Government is not compatible with absolutism. It is therefore struggling to mix up its own forms of free Government with oriental forms. The only escape out of the meshes thus created is for the British to adopt quickly the forms most suited to India. *It would be a mistake however to perpetrate absolutism any longer.* We see that it will no longer do. What then does India want? It wants according to the

genius of the people peace and plenty, and the people and the Government to be welded together as a composite whole by the bonds of sympathy and identity of interests. It does not care for forms of Government. A system of Government where the rulers and the ruled are in full and complete touch is the only solution. The Government must work the people's cause in all direction. Whatever concerns the best interests of the people in trade, commerce, arts, science and industry must become fully and completely the interests of the Government. India has never known in her history separation of the Government from the people and the people have never had the idea of working anything by themselves without Government control and Government protection. Now when they are asked to manage their affairs without the Government's active help they feel cut off from their wonted fountain of life and display want of vitality and strength. This is looked upon as failure on the part of the people to develop capacity for self-government. But it may mean that such a system, being out of tune with the people's life in India, requires the restoring of the old and time-honoured relations between the people and the Government. For instance, the religious endowments when severed from the Government control have become impossible of management by the people. But the moment the Government control is substituted as in Native States, they will go on efficiently and satisfactorily. Even so industry, trade and commerce when left to the people themselves to work out on Western lines of thought and action are found to collapse, but, if they are pushed on with the aid of the Government, will show fresh signs of life and growth. Likewise the spirit of work should be

one of free intermingling of the rulers and the ruled as indispensable parts of the Government based upon a spirit of the highest Imperial unity in carrying on the great Government. It will become Imperial in the true sense and not in the narrow and restricted one. The higher officers, Indian and British and the officers of subordinate ranks as well composed of the various classes, Indian or European, should at once be made to realize a common feeling of comradeship in the administration of the country knowing no difference of creed or caste. The Government must be the sole arbiter in the choice of men for all high offices and the offices thus selected will be animated by a spirit of complete subordination to the Imperial interests and a spirit of equality in the sense of equal opportunities to all and equal treatment to merit. All will be bound exactly by the same duties and the same rights. All this is, of course, subject to the indispensable condition of maintaining the irreducible minimum of British element in the administration of the country. Otherwise it would cease to be British Government and British administration alike; but it would be Indian administration with the British army to guard and to step in only when there are internal dissensions. We know of no Government like this in the world. England is here to rule and not merely to watch a game of Indian politics. What we want is the best form of British rule consistently with efficiency of Government and the progress and prosperity of the people and not merely an ever-receding shadow of the British Government, before a game of Indian democracy. *The basic principle is the Imperial unity of interests and not the weakening of the power or the prestige of the British rule.* Under the

spirit of true Imperial unity the friction between the official and non-official must disappear.

The Native Princes and Chiefs will feel in this Imperial system that their ancient ideals and rights will be preserved and respected so long as they realize that they are part of the British Empire. The social and religious reformation of the country, if it cannot be directly worked by an alien Government could be helped a great deal by the sympathetic Sovereign towards attaining it. All these may appear Utopian, but in truth it is not so. No people will obey more cheerfully the mandates of the Sovereign power in all concerns of life from the biggest to the smallest than the people of India. What they require is merely to be taken in hand in a friendly spirit and shown the way. The unrest of the disloyal and seditious is bound to disappear. We are told that the worst seditionists even, do not want the British rule to go out. On the other hand, they are fully aware that if the British go away, India will lose herself in chaos. For the British to leave India now will be comparatively nothing for England but a terrible blow to India from which she can never recover. For the British to sever from India at this time and at this juncture even as a trial and an experiment will be very like leaving the millions entrusted by Providence to Briton in a helpless stage. Let not unrest even for a moment cause any revulsion of feeling on the part of England towards India. This is the hour of trial for England and India alike. This is the hour of danger. It requires more than ever the fullest strength and the greatest sympathy on the part of England not to forsake the great trust reposed in her of uplifting India. On the part of India, the duty to

England is not less but more. What is now wanted on her part is not passive loyalty but loyalty of an active, robust kind to the British Throne more than ever before. Locked hand in hand, England and India have to prove that the bonds of true Imperial unity must constitute the life of India's future and not severance from the British overlordship. The highest good that India may yet, achieve can be achieved only with Britain over us and her unlimited sympathy for India.

The Hon'ble Mr. Gokhale asks for a declaration from His Majesty, the King-Emperor, on the great occasion of the Delhi Durbar of a democratic form of Government as the end and aim of the British rule. I quite agree that the great and memorable occasion is one eminently befitting the declaration of the policy to be pursued by the Government and it would constitute the Great Proclamation of the year 1911. But the question is what is the policy to be declared? Lord Morley himself declared emphatically that a Parliamentary form of Government for India is not his goal. What then is it to be? I, for one, would much sooner declare it to be one of Limited Monarchy with a Council to help and with a Member of the Royal Family enthroned for ever more in Delhi, the ancient and venerable Indraprastha as our Indian Sovereign and Protector, and pledged to carry out even more fully than hitherto these gracious words of the Proclamation of 1858.

"In their prosperity will be our strength: in their contentment our security: and in their gratitude our best reward. And may the God of all power. grant to US, and to those in authority under US, strength to carry out those our wishes for the good of Our people."

CHAPTER IX.

THE PRESENT SITUATION.

A.—I see the crisis in India has come fully justifying the title of your book. I wonder if you expected that it was coming so soon.

R.—Yes. It has come much quicker than anyone could have expected in England or in India. It is due mainly to causes beyond human ken or control. The unexpected often happens. The Great War is the root cause of the world's ferment at the present moment. Everyone seems to accept that this War is going to prove the turning point in the world's history. The real problem is how the free and civilized countries of the world with England as their centre can best guard against a possible recurrence of a War like this. The great object of the Imperial Federation is to raise bulwarks sufficiently strong to resist the attacks of savagery and brute force set on foot by Germany.

A.—Yes. But what has that to do with the crisis in India.

R.—I cannot see the connection between the War and the cry for "Home rule" in India. The War is nothing more than a savage and cruel play of Germany's greed and earth hunger equipped with all the machinery of destruction mortal man ever possessed. What has that to do with democracy?

A.—They say that the War has forced the pace of democracy all over the world and it has ushered the democratic era. That is said to be the vital connection between the two. That is why they look upon this War as possibly a mighty travail of the world's spirit before a great re-birth. They look upon it as a prelude to the great step in the up-building of the peace and liberties of mankind. That perhaps accounts for the wave of democracy passing over us.

R.—That, no doubt, is what appears from the surface. We are trying to read lessons from this War far too soon. It would be wiser to wait till the War is over before we moralize. For instance, the revolution in Russia has been taken hold of by democrats as an argument in favour of democracy. All that we know is that Russia is at present in the throes of a great conflict both external and internal. Its internal condition may therefore, for aught I know, prove the greatest warning against democracy. At any rate, it can afford at present no safe ground for any conclusion to build upon. "Wait and see" is what I would say about Russia.

A.—I admit the force of your observation but, nevertheless, don't you think that a big wave of democracy is passing over us? Is not the Imperial Federation a great move towards responsible and representative Government? Is not the Imperial Conference a step in the same direction? It appears to be more or less settled that the colonies and the mother country will be brought closer together in the forthcoming Imperial Federation. What is to be the place of India therein? The War has raised India in the estimation of the world. The loyalty of the Indian princes and the people to the British

Throne was put to the test in this War and India has come out in a manner worthy of all praise. The heart of England has been deeply touched by the marvellous and unexampled devotion of India to England. That is the greatest asset that stands to the credit of India at this moment. That is why the Colonies as well as the mother country are anxious that to India must be assigned a proper place in the Imperial Federation. May not this have something to do with rousing the political ambitions of the politicians in India? May not the agitation for Home rule be the outcome to some extent at least of this ambition? May it not be due to the idea that, if the Indian politicians do not make themselves sufficiently heard at a moment like this, the claims of India to a proper place in the Empire might go unheard and unheeded? Don't you think that this is perhaps the most potent cause of the present agitation?

R.—There is a great deal of truth in what you say. It is not the whole truth. Even if it be the whole truth, it cannot alter the main facts of the situation. Everyone admits that India has made out a strong case for her for fair and friendly treatment in the re-arrangement of the various parts of the Empire at the end of the War. The people of India confidently expect that India will be raised to a footing of equality with the rest of the Empire so far as the relations of India to the colonies are concerned. But the real question at issue is whether India has made out a case for democracy or self-government or Home rule it does not matter by what name you call it. Is democracy or Home rule the gift for what India has done in the War, or is it to be given on the ground of India's fitness for self-government quite apart from what she has

done for the War? For what she has done for the War she wants no return. She has done her duty. She has done infinitely less than what she feels as due to her King-Emperor as an expression of her grateful devotion. All that I have said in the previous chapters against planting democracy in India till the ground is made fit for it, stands good. I said that the resistance to democracy comes above all not from without but from within. I said that it comes very largely from the Indian caste system and the Indian social conditions and that, till they are modified substantially, our work must lie not in the direction of planting self-government directly but only in introducing those reforms which would bring out and improve the people's capacity for self-government. That position of mine remains as firm as ever. At the end of the last chapter I said that the form of Government best suited to India was, perhaps, one of Limited Monarchy with a Council to help and with a Member of the Royal Family enthroned in Delhi as our Indian Sovereign and Protector. I still believe that ideal of mine will hold good for a long time to come in India. There is still room for an Oligarchy composed of the best of the European and Indian elements to work the administration. Side by side with that Oligarchy, reforms may be introduced on popular lines suited to the present requirements and calculated to make the people fitter for reaching their goal.

A.—But you overlook the fact that the agitation for Home rule has apparently assumed great proportions during the last two years. If your position is correct, how do you account for this phenomenon? The whole country appears to be surcharged with the one idea that

nothing but Home rule or responsible Government in some substantial form will suffice to meet the requirements of the situation. Is this not genuine? If it is, what is your solution?

R.—The genesis of the Home rule movement must be studied closely and kept in view. How much of it is genuine and how much is spurious must be closely and fearlessly scrutinized? How far the masses are really interested in it and how they would be affected by it must be most carefully weighed. Above all the problem has to be faced in the light of hard facts and figures without yielding to mere sentiment or agitation. I grant that that part of the agitation is genuine which advocates the general principle that the claims of India must be duly recognized in the coming Imperial Federation. That part of the agitation is also genuine which claims fellowship and equality in political status between India and the Colonies. That part of the agitation is spurious which has deliberately overlooked the social conditions in India needless, of all warnings. Unable and unwilling to face the social problems our politicians have launched forth a political propaganda which is amazing in its ambition. That part of the agitation is again spurious which has adopted the tactics of blackening and belittling the British Government and its responsible officers and administrators. That the masses in India are, as they have always been, absolutely indifferent to political agitation of one sort or another is undeniable. The case for Home rule is sought to be made out not so much on the fitness of the people as on the unfitness of the bureaucracy. This is the initial blunder in the Home rule tactics and methods. Were I pleading for Home rule, I would base

it on the fitness of the people and if they are not yet fit I would moderate my demands.

A.—How do you make out that the people are not yet fit for Home rule?

R.—I have been constantly urging that Indian progress has been dangerously one-sided in devoting itself to political work both in India and in England, neglecting the social. I have been pointing out the dangers of democracy in a country like India with its teeming millions divided endlessly among themselves in the name of caste and religion. Now, we are face to face with the situation. The truth of my observations has been proved to the hilt by what we are witnessing to-day. The Home rulers posed before the country as if they had captured every class and community and as if the whole country were in a mood to vote solid for Home rule. That is the idea with which the Home rule agitation started. The Home rulers, it must be said, have shown their art of agitation to perfection. It looked as if fort after fort and citadel after citadel were captured for Home rule. The Home rulers went about urging that we are within sight of the political millennium and all that the country had to do was to present a solid front in favour of Home rule. Who would not be taken up with the idea, who would be so unpatriotic as to wish ill for his country and countrymen when Home rule is dangled before his vision as within his grasp? When every class and community was told that someone else was responsible for all the evils we are suffering from and that they would all disappear the moment we ousted him from his place, is it any wonder that such a cry caught the imagination of young minds at school and college and of the average

man who would gladly welcome anything which is said to be for his betterment? Those who fight for Home rule get honoured as patriots. Those who suffer for it are reckoned as martyrs. The cry for Home rule has in it every element which can make for notoriety or popularity, while everyone who is an anti-Home ruler is branded forthwith as a traitor to his country's cause. This was the stock in trade with which the Home rule agitation commenced for political exploitation of the country. Defiance to authority became a virtue. Distrust in Government and their motives and actions became a part of the creed. The worst, however, has befallen our students. Their young and impressionable minds have been victimized to the one idea that there is something rotten some where and that they should join and swell the cry for Home rule. Incessant attacks against the British Government and against their methods and motives cannot but widen the breach between the Government and the people and weaken in the minds of the students their sense of discipline and attachment to British Raj. There are some of the achievements of the Home rule agitation, but, thank God, there is a limit to everything. Truth has a stern visage. She is often hidden by artificial masks thrown over her. She is often hidden by clouds of passion and prejudice. She is, however, patience personified. She sits firm and unmoved like a monument amidst storms that may rage round her. But when she begins to shine driving the clouds before her and the passions and prejudices around her, nothing can stand which has a touch of selfishness or falsehood however veiled or concealed. The Home rule agitation went on under a mask far too long in

the name of the country and now the country roused to a sense of its duty to speak the truth. You find Conference after Conference all over the country of every class and community opposing Home rule as only the cry of a small and selfish class. This opposition to Home rule is gaining daily and hourly volume and strength. In Southern India especially the hard limitations of caste and sect are still so powerful and pernicious that Home rule is honestly dreaded as a cruel mockery of social and political justice as well, by all the other classes except the Brahmans. In the face of such opposition from the people, I fail to see the wisdom of planting Home rule in India just now. When the people do not want it, how can it be forced on them? I do not see how the county will suffer by Home rule deferred till it is fit for it. I have no doubt that the great opposition to Home rule we witness to-day all over the country has come in time to save us from democracy. It shows at any rate beyond doubt that our advance towards Home rule or self-government must be gradual and slow. You can never forget that in India political advance cannot be made by leaps and bounds. Our social conditions quickly assert themselves and prove our stumbling block. As the late Mr. Ranade said "Politics is not merely petitioning and memorializing for gifts and favours. Gifts and favours are of no value when we have not deserved the concessions by our own elevation and our own strength." This has been the position of the Moderates all along. Give me the measure of your social reform and I shall give you the measure of your political deserts. I assert that in India we can never lose sight of the fact that between the political step you wish to

take and the social step you have taken there is always an intimate connection and it will be disastrous to ignore it.

A.—You forget that the school of Moderates has vanished into thin air. The voice of the Moderate is no longer heard. I do not see any difference between the Moderates and Extremists. They seem to have been rolled into one mass and are labelled to-day "Home rulers."

R.—If so, so much the worse for us. The difference between the Moderates and the Extremists is a real one and it must never be forgotten. It lies, first, in their attitude towards the British Government and, secondly, in the methods they adopt. The attitude of Moderates is one of unquestionable loyalty to the British Throne, and it is a part of their creed that India cannot get on without British Government for a day and that for a long time to come British overlordship is the only guarantee for the safety of India and its security from internal and external troubles. On the other hand, the Extremists differ so radically from the Moderates that they seem to think that no great danger would befall the country if the British rule should cease this moment. They seem to think that the country is so fit for self-government already that the only thing they should do is to agitate and take, if possible, the reins of Government in their hands. The difference between the two schools has always been that the Moderates hold that India is not yet fit for "Home rule" and that we must make it fit by social and religious reconstruction as the only safe foundation on which it can be built, whereas the Extremists pay no heed to our social conditions and demand Home

rule *at once*. The bulk of the opinion of the country is asserting itself clearly and unmistakably in favour of a policy of slow and gradual up-building instead of a sudden and cataclysmic change in the machinery of Government.

A.—I accept your definition of Moderates and Extremists as about the best for all practical purposes; but how did the Moderates lose their lead?

R.—You remember the remarkable saying of the late Mr. Gokhale. He said "The tallest of us have to bend low." That feeling of the Moderates must go out and give place to one of robust comradeship with the British. If this great and vital change had been effected in the administration of the country, I believe that matters would not have come to this pass. It is not too late to do so. If this is done, it will open up a fresh era in our administration. The question is which will you have, democracy, for which India is not yet fit, or an Oligarchy composed of the best elements British and Indian, for which the country is fit? India has never been wanting in men of individual eminence fit to hold the highest places of trust and responsibility but it can never be suddenly democratized in the face of the monarchical and caste civilization of India. No doubt, Western education and the Western spirit of democracy have proved, as anticipated, the leaven in the yeast and has brought into conflict the two civilizations. In such cases the best principle to lay down is that whatever you may do, *don't put the cart before the horse*. By all means widen the sphere of usefulness of Indians. Let no Indian of character or merit feel that in the race he is running with the strongest nation in the world he is handicapped or

treated unfairly. But before you transfer the reins of Government to the masses or their representatives with the dead weight of ages of prejudice, passions and hatreds still hanging round the necks of all but a few, let us pause and take stock of the actual conditions, thoughts and feelings of the country. If we do so, we shall have to admit the correctness of my position.

A.—But you overlook the fact that in an Oligarchy composed of the best of the British and Indian elements the power of initiative would still be lacking. The problem seems to be how to devise a system under which the Indians will get the necessary training to manage their own affairs more and more, and develop all that is best in them. If you still think of continuing the administration on oligarchical lines, would not the chances of training India on lines of self-government be virtually closed?

R.—They need not necessarily be. Government on oligarchical lines, if best suited to the Indian genius and the Indian traditions, must be kept up. Side by side with it the popular element may grow as an adjunct to it. The fatal mistake lies in the conception that the two are opposed to each other. For instance, there is at present a great experiment going on in Mysore the central idea of which is to bring the popular element into close contact with the Government. The object appears to be to blend as far as possible the elements of Monarchy and Oligarchy with the popular element. The Mysore State while fully alive to the necessity for developing the critical and constructive faculties of the people in all matters touching their well-being as a necessary and useful auxiliary to the State, has wisely limited the function

of the popular element to deliberation and suggestion. Quite recently the Mysore State has added a social and civic side to its activities. The great point is whether in growing the popular element in monarchical India, you mean it only as a supplement to the State activities, or do you mean to allow it to supplant the very machinery of Government to any extent. I do not think the Native States in India will ever allow Home rule of the kind the Memorandum of Nineteen is asking for. It has often struck me that the problem of Home rule may be allowed to be first solved by the Native States and then we may follow suit. If in any part of India the conditions are most suited for an experiment it is, I should think, in the Native States. They have got the advantage of smaller areas and populations to deal with. They have got freedom of initiative. Before introducing democracy in British India, I would certainly wait and see how the experiment works there.

A.—I admit the force of your observation. But the only objection I foresee is that the comparison between the Native States and the British Government is not to the point, because in the Native States there is not that conflict of interests between the European and Indian elements, which you see in British India. What the Home rulers oppose is obviously the European Oligarchy. They advance Home rule as a necessary check to it. That is the point we have to face.

R.—I need hardly say that when one country rules over another some conflict of interests is inevitable. The question is what is the proper remedy? As I said, the blending of the best elements European and Indian in the administration is the most prudent in the present

state of the country. A running man may read that, as between a European Oligarchy and a Brahman Oligarchy if a choice has to be made by the people, they would unhesitatingly vote for the European. The Brahman Oligarchy means perpetuation of castes. It means subjection of women to the thraldom of ages. It means for the millions of depressed classes not much hope of redemption. Brahmanism is now on its trial. It only stands to reason that if the Brahmans would pull down those above them in power in the name of Home rule, they must be prepared to be pulled down in their turn by those below them in the social scale, for whom they have done nothing for ages. Brahmanism is now face to face with "Demos" and it must either answer the question or be prepared to be swallowed by the spirit it has conjured into existence. We cannot have democracy as well as caste. The one or the other must go. The cry for democracy comes mostly from people who still believe in infant marriage, in enforced widowhood, and in keeping their womenkind largely under ignorance and subjection. Just conceive what would be the result of introducing democracy under such conditions. It would only be sowing the seeds of anarchism and civil war which God forbid. If you give up democracy as hopeless for the time being, the next question is, what then should we do? I believe that the time is come for all of us, Europeans and Indians, taking together a great step towards mutual confidence, mutual trust and mutual good-feeling, socially and politically, instead of remaining where we are, or what is worse, instead of trying to go backward. Whatever may happen, onward must be the march, upward must be the human effort. The power for good of the

European element in India, official and non-official, can hardly be overrated. On the other hand, we want Indians who are capable of sobriety of thought and who can realize how much of training India still needs before she can be fit for self-government. We want on both sides a large measure of forbearance and good-feeling. The solution of the problem rests with liberal-minded Europeans and Indians who must join hands and work together. I therefore think that there is still room for an Oligarchy composed of the best of these two elements, Indian and European. What India needs now is not self-government at a leap and bound, but fuller opportunities for developing the capacity for self-government. What is needed is not so much the devolution of power from the Government the people, as greater confidence and trust in the Indians and a feeling of comradeship between them and the Europeans in carrying on the administration. Greater freedom in the management of our Municipal Councils. Taluk and District Boards may well be given but if to the impatient idealists any concession must be made, we must examine the schemes before the country. One is the Memorandum of Nineteen. The other is Mr. Gokhale's scheme.

A.—What do you think of these two schemes? Which would you prefer? Or would you put forward any other scheme?

R.—That is the most difficult part of our work. We shall try and formulate it as best as we can.

CHAPTER X.

THE SOLUTION.

A.—What then is your scheme?

R.—Everyone seems to be so busy drafting his own scheme just now that I am afraid we shall have too many schemes. The best thing to do is to lay down the principles and leave the details to be worked out by the authorities concerned. Every class and community is drafting its own scheme almost in a state of panic, that if it did not speak out its mind the interests of his class might not be safe-guarded. The Memorandum of Nineteen has proved a veritable call to arms to all the other classes and communities who are opposed to it. The Home rulers were unprepared for such an outburst of opposition. I may at once say that the Memorandum is amazing in its ambition. Compared with it Mr. Gokhale's scheme is moderation itself. I wonder why the Home rulers did not limit their ambition even to Mr. Gokhale's scheme, which, I fancy, must satisfy the most ambitious who possess an eye for constructive statesmanship. One is pained to see the scant courtesy shown to Mr. Gokhale's scheme by the Home rulers. Were proof wanted to show how Utopian the Memorandum is, we need only realize how soon the country has forgotten Mr. Gokhale and thrown him overboard as an antiquated relic of the past. It is curious to note that the hardest cut on

Mr. Gokhale's scheme has come from a quarter least expected. His own successor in the Servants of India Society has given the goby to Mr. Gokhale's scheme on the ground that he was too ill at the time and that his scheme was not a final pronouncement of his views.

A.—Yes, it is curious how quickly they have dropped Mr. Gokhale down. It is a very sad comment on the political tendencies of the times. Then, would you give preference to Mr. Gokhale's scheme?

R.—If the choice lies between the two schemes, I would certainly prefer Mr. Gokhale's scheme, infinitely to the Memorandum of Nineteen. The Memorandum has thrown to the winds all ideas of caution and statesmanship and is visionary and impracticable in the main. The scheme of Mr. Gokhale certainly bears the impress of fairness and self-restraint which the Memorandum lacks. For instance, the Memorandum excludes the members of the Civil Service from the Executive Councils. Mr. Gokhale's scheme does not do so. Do you think that on so simple and vital a point Mr. Gokhale's scheme could be ignored? Does it not show that Mr. Gokhale refused to be a party to the blind crusade against the members of the Civil Service which, however, is the stock-in-trade of the Home rulers? Again, the Memorandum wants Indian members in the Executive Councils to be elected. On this vital point again, Mr. Gokhale's scheme differs from it. Can it be said that Mr. Gokhale did not know enough about our conditions to realize that the country had become fit for so high a political function as the election of members to the Executive Councils? It is clear that on both these points, the ground on which the Memorandum of Nineteen stands is very slippery

indeed. Mr. Gokhale left the choice of Indian members to the Executive Council to the Government and left it free to them to select for the place an official or non-official according to the merits of the person concerned. The Memorandum wants to exclude from the Executive Councils the Indian official element as well as the members of the Civil Service. When it says that they must be elected by Legislative Councils and that official experience is no necessary qualification for the office, it means that the official element is practically doomed. Every time a vacancy occurred in the Indian membership of the Executive Council there was a storm of opposition raised against the appointment of an official, and it was urged unqualifiedly that the place must go to a non-official. Now everyone in India whose opinion is worth anything knows that it is absurd to pitch the non-official as against the official and claim to the non-official *as such* all virtue and wisdom and put down the official as disqualified for the highest place in the Government merely because he is an official. Analogies drawn from English political life in support of this position are utterly false and misleading. Eminent Indians in the past and present who have come up to the highest positions of trust and confidence under the Government are mostly men whose character and talent got the necessary moulding by a rigid official training and discipline. Raja Sir T. Madhava Rao, Mr. Seshayya Sastri, Sir K. Seshadri Iyer, Mr. Rangacharlu, Dewan of Mysore, and Sir P. N. Krishnamurthi, and host of others, not to mention the living men, all rose from the ranks and owed their success as administrators to their official knowledge and experience. Just fancy the idea of excluding such men on the ground that they were officials.

Fancy the idea of making ignorance or want of knowledge of the details of administration a qualification for the highest place in the Government of a country. I am sure of one thing, that men like Sir T. Madhava Rao would never have come up under a system of election like that advocated by the Memorandum. It speaks volumes in favour of Mr. Gokhale's sense of fairness and wisdom that he, though one of the finest examples of what a non-official can be, had no such prejudice against the official element as the Memorandum displays. It is amusing, to say the least, that 9 out of 10 of the non-officials who criticize the official elements in and out of season wish to make their criticism only a stepping stone for getting into office. I am a great believer in training and discipline. The higher the office one seeks, the harder must be the training he should have and the severer the discipline he should undergo. Powers of speech or debate, however brilliant, can hardly replace the knowledge and experience of years gathered in the practical administration of the country. We want a combination of both. We want not only brilliant speakers but they must be solid workers as well and they must above all be men of a broad and clear outlook and free from those class and caste prejudices which constitute the besetting sin in the Indian administration.

One other point may be mentioned, and, that is, communal representation. Mr. Gokhale's scheme is silent on it. The Memorandum of Nineteen is equally silent. But the recent agitation against Home rule has brought out prominently the fact that unless communal representation is granted, the interests of the voiceless majority

will suffer in the hands of the powerful and noisy minority. The weakness on principle in communal representation is that it tends to crystallize the existing caste differences. But the great point in its favour is that it is the only way of holding the balance evenly between the various classes in India. I look upon communal representation only as a sheer necessity in the present state of things, to protect the interests of those which would otherwise suffer. Let the Home rulers either drop their demand for Home rule if the country is not yet fit for it, or let them accept it on a communal basis as a matter of fairplay to all the classes concerned and work it as best as they can. That communal representation is necessary only shows how imperfect our social conditions are and what little confidence the classes have in each other. It is a sad comment on our fitness for Home rule.

About the reconstitution of Imperial Council again, Mr. Gokhale's scheme deserves preference. The main idea of Mr. Gokhale was to introduce Provincial Autonomy so as to enlarge the Provincial Legislative Councils and their sphere of work and usefulness and ensure their financial independence. The resolutions of the Local Governments in regard to the Budget and on questions of general administration were to be given effect to unless vetoed by the Governor. This is a very great step indeed in advance from a practical point of view. But on impractical visionaries even this has failed to impress as sufficient. While I would adhere to Mr. Gokhale's scheme as the better of the two, I would add that it requires very careful examination. Between Mr. Gokhale's Provincial Autonomy and the present state, there must,

I think, be an intermediate stage for the necessary training and discipline.

A.—What then are the general principles on which you would base your scheme?

R.—The first principle I would lay down is that, unless the Indian politicians bring up the rear and strenuously work for social solidarity and unity, no great step could be taken by way of transferring power from the Government to the people. Till then, our lines of progress must be cautions and tentative. Secondly, the minds of the political leaders must be turned even in the field of politics towards solid and constructive work for the people instead of being, as it is, all agitation and destructive criticism. Their work must begin from the village upwards in Education, Sanitation, Arts and Industries and they must work on well-organized and definite principles, instead of being content with the formation of Home Rule Leagues and indulging in explosive sentiments which only tend to foster a spirit of defiance to authority, and distrust in the motives and actions of the Government. If only the real work for the uplifting of the country is taken up by the impatient idealists, they will soon find what an amount of hard work lies before them without exciting political passions and prejudices. All that work is now left behind under the erroneous impression that, until India gets Home rule, we can do nothing. This false creed must give place to the true one. The Home rulers practically say "Give us Home rule and we shall make the country fit for it." The truth is just the other way. Make the country fit for it, and then ask for it. Some of the very demands made show how inconsistent they are. For instance, up in the

north there is an institution working on strictly ancient lines of thought, on the ancient Aryan model. They wish to bring up our men and women on those lines. They seem to have for their ideal the Vedic past. It is a great experiment but it remains to be seen how it will work. The Indian women belonging to that body have memorialized on behalf of the Indian women for a great deal of freedom for them in matters social and political. Down in the south there is an association wedded to orthodoxy of the most backward type which wants to maintain the distinctions of caste and sect *intact*, and keep the women down. But the most ridiculous part of their cry is that they too want "Home rule." That they are welcomed by the Home rule papers, is a striking proof that the Home rulers are most of them not only backward socially, but *mean* to be so, and wish to perpetuate the Indian social system side by side with Home rule. Nothing can be more incongruous and dangerous to the public well-being, than perpetuate the Indian social system, side by side with Home rule. In Bombay some of the leading social reformers ask for social legislation, while in Madras the spirit of orthodoxy is so strong that it says Home rule or no Home rule the Legislative Councils should have no power to interfere in our social concerns by legislation. Look at these extremes and make the necessary inference. Again, while in Madras 9 out of 10 Home rulers are Brahmans, who are, mind you, a very small fraction of the population, the non-brahmans 9 out of 10, dread Home rule as nothing more than Brahminocracy. This dread of the non-brahmans is quite honest because in Southern India the form Brahmi-

nocracy has assumed, religiously and socially, has proved and is still proving the most fearful stumbling block to social advancement. The spirit of the landed aristocracy cannot be in favour of Home rule, because the blood in their veins is too proud to bend to the level of the common man. At one end of the social scale you find millions known as the "Depressed Classes" all over India whose social liberation must be the first concern of every true patriot. The weight of the caste system is still on them, and, but for the British Government and the Christian Missionaries, they would not be what they are to-day. When they realize their power and rebel against caste in the name of democracy, all the higher classes who have been keeping them down till now will have such a terrible time of it that I shouldn't be surprised if they all exclaim "Save us from democracy." People who realize the deep roots struck in India, by the monarchical and aristocratic sentiments, in every form and shape, will write the word "*Caution*" in big letters, as the foremost element in political advance on democratic lines, leaving it free in every other direction. This is the greatest principle I would enjoin on all who wish well for India and England. If the British are really anxious to plant democracy in India, there appears to be only one way of doing it and, that is, that they should settle down in India and work out Indian social problems hand in hand with Indians. Here is a wide field of work for the British men and women, if they really think that, without democracy or Home Rule, India, will perish. A work like this undertaken on purely social lines, will soon disclose two things. First, that if India is left to itself the chances of its evolving

self-government on modern lines are very remote indeed, and, secondly, that if it does want to have it, India will have to go into the smelting-pot and pour itself out into new moulds of thought and feeling, socially and religiously, before she builds up self-government on Western lines.

To sum up my views, India in all its tangled history has never enjoyed a juster or more friendly rule than it has received at England's hand. Mistakes have been made, no doubt, and will continue to be made in the administration of an Empire containing 320 millions of souls and embracing so many warring castes, sects and religions, but no sane Indian would deny that the mistakes made are insignificant when compared to the good accomplished and the progress made. Let us frankly admit that we owe our intellectual, moral and material advance to the Pax Britannica and our King-Emperor's generous and sympathetic rule. Were the English administrators suddenly to be removed or were British control to be seriously impaired, India would revert to its jarring component parts and all hope of her nationality would vanish. Creed would rise against creed and caste against caste whilst interest would conflict with interest. "Hasten slowly" must be our motto. Social reform which we Indians ourselves must effect must precede political revolution. Of the two schemes of Political Reform now before us, that of "The Nineteen" is revolutionary in character and on the very face of it visionary and inpracticable. Its immediate introduction would spell disaster to all the best interests ol India. On the other hand, Mr. Gokhale's scheme, if possibly too ambitious for immediate acceptance, is drafted on statesmanlike and

sane lines. Till something better is evolved, it does and should hold the field. But it has to be approached cautiously and subjected to close and critical examination before we finally commit ourselves to it. This, I trust, is what we may expect to come of the Secretary of State's visit to India and his close association with our Viceroy.

Meantime, let me end as I began by emphasizing once again the two cardinal points upon which I, as an Indian, take may stand. The first is that until we have removed our social disabilities arising out of the caste system we can make no real progress towards national unity. The second is that for many years to come we must work in friendship and harmony with our British fellow-citizens to whose support and encouragement the Indian nation if we may so style ourselves owes its awakening and re-birth.

APPENDIX I.

Mr. GOKHALE'S POLITICAL TESTAMENT.

Provincial Autonomy.

The grant of Provincial Autonomy foreshadowed in the Delhi Despatch, would be a fitting concession to make to the people of India at the close of the War. This will involve the two-fold operation of freeing the Provincial Governments on one side from the greater part of the control which is at present exercised over them by the Government of India and the Secretary of State in connection with the internal administration of the country and substituting on the other, in place of control so removed, the control of the representatives of tax-payers through Provincial Legislative Councils. I indicate below in brief outline the form of administration that should be set up in different Provinces to carry out this idea.

Each Province should have—

1. A Governor appointed from England at the head of the administration.

2. A Cabinet of Executive Council of six members, three of whom should be Englishmen and three Indians with the following portfolio :—

(*a*) Home (including Law and Justice).

(*b*) Finance.

(*c*) Agriculture, Irrigation and Public Works.

(*d*) Education.

(*e*) Local Self-Government (including Sanitation and Medical Relief).

(*f*) Industries and Commerce.

While members of the Indian Civil Service should be eligible for appointment to the Executive Council, on place in the Council should be reserved for them, best men available being taken both English and Indian.

3. A Legislative Council of between 75 and 100 members of whom not less than four-fifths should be elected by different constituencies and interests. Thus in the Bombay Presidency, roughly speaking, each district should return two members, one representing Municipalities and the other District and Taluk Boards. The City of Bombay should have about ten members allotted to it. Bodies in the Mofussil like the Karachi Chamber, Ahmedabad Mill-owners, Deccan Sardars should have a member each. Then there would be the special representation of Mahomedans, and here and there a member may have to be given to communities like the Lingayats, where they are strong. There should be no nominated non-official members except as experts. A few official members may be added by the Governor as experts or to assist in representing the Executive Government.

4. The relations between the Executive Government and the Legislative Council so constituted should be roughly similar to those between the Imperial Government and the Reichstag in Germany. The Council will have to pass all Provincial Legislation and its assent will be necessary to additions to or changes in Provincial

taxation. The Budget too will have to come to it for discussion and its resolutions in connection with it as also on questions of general administration will have to be given effect to unless vetoed by the Governor. More frequent meetings or longer continuous sittings will also have to be provided for. But the members of the Executive Government shall not depend, individually or collectively, on the support of a majority of the Council for holding their office.

5. The Provincial Government, so reconstituted and working under the control of the Legislative Council, as outlined above should have complete charge of the internal administration of the Province, and it should have virtually independent financial powers, the present financial relations between it and the Government of India being largely revised, and to some extent even reversed. The revenue under Salt, Customs, Tributes, Railways, Post, Telegraph and Mint should belong exclusively to the Government of India, the services being Imperial, while that under Land Revenue including Irrigation, Excise, Forests, Assessed Taxes, Stamps and Registration should belong to the Provincial Government the services being Provincial. As under this division, the revenue falling to the Provincial Government will be in excess of its existing requirements and that assigned to the Government of India will fall short of its present expenditure, the Provincial Government should be required to make an annual contribution to the Government of India, fixed for periods of five years at a time. Subject to this arrangement, the Imperial and the Provincial Governments should develop their separate systems of finance the Provincial Governments

being given powers of taxation and borrowing within certain limits.

Such a scheme of Provincial Autonomy will be incomplete unless it is accompanied by (*a*) liberalizing of the present form of District administration and (*b*) a great extension of Local Self-Government. For (*a*) it will be necessary to abolish the Commissionerships of Divisions except where special reasons may exist for their being maintained as in Sind, and to associate small District Councils, partly elected and partly nominated, with the Collector for whom most of the present powers of the Commissioners could then be transferred the functions of the Councils being advisory to begin with. For (*b*) Village Panchayats, partly elected and partly nominated, should be created for villages and groups of villages and Municipal Boards in Towns, and Taluk Boards in Taluks should be made wholly elected bodies, the Provincial Government reserving to itself and exercising stringent powers of control. A portion of the Excise revenue should be made over to those bodies, so that they may have adequate resources at their disposal for the due performance of their duties. The district being too large an area for efficient Local Self-Government by an honorary agency, the functions of the District Boards should be strictly limited and the Collector should continue to be its *ex-officio* President.

THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.

I. The Provinces being thus rendered practically autonomous, the constitution of the Executive Council or the Cabinet of the Viceroy will have to be correspondingly

altered. At present, there are four members in that Council with portfolios which concern the internal administration of the country, namely, Home, Agriculture, Education and Industries and Commerce. As all internal administration will now be made over to Provincial Governments and the Government of India will only retain in its hands nominal control to be exercised on very rare occasions, one member to be called member for the Interior should suffice in place of these four. It will, however, be necessary to create certain other portfolios, and I would have the Council consist of the following six members (at least two of whom shall always be Indians).

(*a*) Interior, (*b*) Finance, (*c*) Law, (*d*) Defence, (*e*) Communications (Railways, Post and Telegraph) and (*f*) Foreign.

2. The Legislative Council of the Viceroy should be styled the Legislative Assembly of India. Its members should be raised to about one hundred to begin with and its powers enlarged, but the principle of an official majority (for which perhaps it will suffice to substitute a nominated majority) should, for the present, be maintained until sufficient experience has been gathered of the working of autonomous arrangements for the Provinces. This will give the Government of India a reserve power in connection with Provincial administration to be exercised in emergencies. Thus if a Provincial Legislative Council persistently declines to pass legislation which the Government regard to be essential in the vital interests of the Province, it could be passed by the Government of India in its Legislative Assembly over the head of the Province. Such occasions would be extremely rare, but the reserve power will give a sense of security to the

authorities and will induce them to enter on the great experiment of Provincial Autonomy with greater readiness. Subject to this principle of an official or nominated majority being for the present maintained, the Assembly should have increased opportunities of influencing the policy of the Government by discussion, questions connected with the Army and Navy (to be now created) being placed on a level with other questions. In fiscal matters, the Government of India so constituted should be freed from the control of Secretary of State, whose control in other matters too should be largely reduced his Council being abolished and his position steadily approximated to that of the Secretary of State for the Colonies.

Commissions in the Army and Navy must now be given to Indians with proper facilities for Military and Naval instruction.

German East Africa, if conquered from the Germans, should be reserved for Indian colonization and should be handed over to the Government of India.

APPENDIX II.

THE MEMORANDUM OF NINETEEN.

In all the Executive Councils, Provincial and Imperial, half the number of members should be Indians. The European element in the Executive Councils should, as far as possible, be nominated from the ranks of men trained and educated in the public life of England, so that India may have the benefit of a wider outlook and larger experience of the outside world. It is not absolutely essential that the members of the Executive Councils, Indians and Europeans, should have experience of actual administration; for, as in the case of Ministers in England, the assistance of the permanent officials of the department is always available to them. As regards Indians, we venture to say that a sufficient number of qualified Indians, who can worthily fill the office of members of the Executive Council and hold portfolios, is always available. Our short experience in this direction has shown how Indians like Sir S. P. Sinha, Sir Syed Ali Imam, the late Mr. Krishnaswami Iyer, Sir Shams-ul-Huda and Sir Sankaran Nair have maintained a high level of administrative ability in the discharge of their duties. Moreover, it is well-known that the Native States, where Indians have opportunities have produced renowned administrators like Sir Salar Jang, Sir T. Madhava Rao, Sir Seshadri Iyer, Dewan Bahadur Raghunatha Rao, not to mention

the present administrators in the various Native States of India. The statutory obligations now existing, that three of the members of the Supreme Executive Council shall be selected from the public services in India and similar provinces with regard to Provincial Councils should be removed. The elected representatives of the people should have a voice in the selection of the Indian members of the Executive Councils and for that purpose a principle of election should be adopted.

2. All the Legislative Councils in India should have a substantial majority of elected representatives. We feel that they will watch and safeguard the interests of the masses and the agricultural population, with whom they are in closer touch than any European officer, however sympathetic, can possibly be. The proceedings of the various Legislative Councils, the Indian National Congress and the Moslem League bear ample testimony to the solicitude of the educated Indians for the welfare of the masses and their acquaintance with their wants and wishes. The franchise should be broadened and extended directly to the people, Mahomedans or Hindus, wherever they are in a minority, being given proper and adequate representation having regard to their numerical strength and position.

3. The total number of the members of the Supreme Council should be not less than 150, and the Provincial Councils no less than 100 for the major provinces and not less than 60 to 75 for the minor provinces.

4. The Budget should be passed in the shape of money bills, fiscal autonomy being conceded to India.

5. The Imperial Legislative Council should have power to legislate on all matters and to discuss and pass

resolutions relating to all matters of Indian administration, and the Provincial Councils should have similar powers with regard to Provincial administrations save and except that the direction of military affairs, of foreign relations, declarations of war, making of peace and the entering into treaties other than commercial, should be vested in the Government of India. As a safeguard, the Governor-General-in-Council or the Governor-in-Council, as the case may be, should have the right of veto, but subject to certain conditions and limitations.

6. The Council of the Secretary of State should be abolished. The Secretary of State should, as far as possible, hold in relation to the Government of India a possession similar to that which the Secretary of State for the Colonies holds in relation to the Colonies. The Secretary of State should be assisted by two permanent Under Secretaries, one of whom should be an Indian. The salaries of the Secretary and the Under Secretaries should be placed on the British estimates.

7. In any scheme of Imperial Federation, India should be given, through her chosen representatives, a place similar to that of the self-governing dominions.

8. The Provincial Governments should be made autonomous as stated in the Government of India's Despatch, dated 25th August, 1911.

9. The United Provinces as well as the other major provinces should have a Governor brought from the United Kingdom with an Executive Council.

10. A full measure of Local Self-Government should be immediately granted.

11. The right to carry arms should be granted to Indians on the same conditions as to Europeans.

12. Indians should be allowed to enlist as volunteers and units of a Territorial Army established in India.

13. Commissions in the army should be given to Indian youths under conditions similar to those applicable to Europeans.